[illegible]

THE TRUE SABBATH.

WHICH DAY SHALL WE KEEP?

AN EXAMINATION OF

MRS. ELLEN WHITE'S VISIONS.

BY

MILES GRANT.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY THE
ADVENT CHRISTIAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
160 HANOVER STREET.
1877.

THE TRUE SABBATH.

WHICH DAY SHALL WE KEEP?

AN EXAMINATION OF

MRS. ELLEN WHITE'S VISIONS.

BY

MILES GRANT.

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY THE
ADVENT CHRISTIAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
160 HANOVER STREET.
1874.

Prof Sat. is Lord's day Rev. 1:10.
Ex 20:8-10. 31:13. Isa. 58:13. Mark 2:28

SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.

BY MILES GRANT.

It is well known that there are quite a number who believe that Saturday should be the Christian's rest day, instead of the Lord's day, which has been generally observed by the disciples of Jesus during the entire Christian dispensation. It is claimed by those who keep the seventh day, that the time is at hand when the keeping of the first day will constitute "the mark of the beast"; hence such must be finally condemned and destroyed. As this doctrine is made a test of fellowship, thus dividing christian families and churches, it seems important that the truth should be made plain, and widely scattered among the people. Looking at the subject from this stand-point, the love we have for the welfare of the church of Christ prompts us to say what follows.

Circumstances have required us to give this subject our special attention. We do not wish to uphold error, nor oppose truth. All we desire is to please the Lord. We shall condense our thoughts into as small a compass as possible, believing it will be most acceptable to the reader. We will first notice

We argue the old abolished.

the two covenants or testaments—the old and the new—the first and the second. Under which are we now living? If the old, then all its requirements are still binding; if under the new, then the old is ended. The first covenant was made with the children of Israel at Mt. Sinai, when Moses acted as mediator between the Lord and the people.

The following are some of the plain Scriptures which show that the ten commandments constituted the first, or old covenant:—

"And he declared unto you his *covenant*, which he commanded you to perform, even *ten commandments*, and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. 4: 13. Again Moses says: "When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the *covenant* which the Lord made with you, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights. . . . . And it came to pass, at the end of forty days and forty nights, that the Lord gave me the two tables of stone, even the tables of the *covenant*. . . . . So I turned and came down from the mount, ... and the two tables of the *covenant* were in my two hands." Deut. 9: 9, 11, 15. "He was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights. . . . . And he wrote upon the tables the words of the *covenant*, the ten commandments." Ex. 34: 28.

This covenant, made with the children of Israel, at Mt. Sinai, after they came out of Egypt, was *national*, and to be kept by all the people. It was for their temporal welfare as a *nation*, and had no reference to their final salvation in the world to come. It has no command to love God, or our neighbor.

False. See Ex. 20:6; Rom. 13:8-10; 1 John 5:3; Matt. 22:35-46.

It merely speaks of the *consequences* of love and hatred. One could keep the old covenant and be destitute of love to God or man, just as a boy may keep his father's commandments through fear of a whipping if he disobeys. Read over with care the old covenant, as follows:—

"And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it. Honor thy father and mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." Ex. 20: 1–17.

The whole force of the covenant consists in the phrase, "THOU SHALT NOT." This covenant was addressed to a disobedient, rebellious people, and was composed of some of the common moral precepts necessary for their social welfare in this world. No such commands as these will be needed by the saved in the world to come; and had those Jews loved the Lord with all their hearts, there would have been no occasion for such a covenant to secure their temporal welfare; but they did not keep even this; hence were destroyed as a nation, and brought into subjection to other governments. The *memorial* day, contained in the fourth commandment, was placed in the heart of the old covevant, that they might be continually reminded of their wonderful deliverance from Egyptian bondage, by the mighty hand of the Lord.

False

See Page 3 and Ex 20:4c

In Deut. 5: 15, when speaking of the reason for choosing this as their rest day, the Lord says: "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." No other nation but the Jewish could keep this memorial day, because no other one was thus delivered from Egyptian bondage. Servants and proselytes, in Jewish families and communities, were required to observe the same memorial day in order that they might worship harmoniously. This was their leading feast day. The Jewish festival days were commemorative days, and they were required to keep them holy, and assemble in holy convocations. They were all called "feast days." In Lev. 23: 1–8, we read:—

See your notes.

Then Ex. 20:11 shows all men should keep it.

(7th day Sabbath never called feast-day)

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my *feasts*. Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, a holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein; it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings. These are the *feasts* of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons. In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord; seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days; in the seventh day is a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein."

These and other feast days were their sacred days, and they were required to keep their Sabbath, or rest day, prominent, because it commemorated the most important event in their history,—their deliverance from the heavy yoke of Egyptian bondage.

Never so called

We find no evidence that the rest day of the Jews corresponded with the seventh day of the *original week.* See Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 16 & 20:8-11.

The Lord instructed them to work *six* days, and rest the *seventh*. It appears that this special arrangement began when they came out of Egypt. Their first rest day in the wilderness must be so arranged that there would be six days of labor between it and the time they left their state of bondage. At Mount Sinai, this memorial day was incorporated into the first or old covenant, where it was to remain as a sacred day so long as that covenant was in force, and no longer.

No proof

Paul says, "The first covenant had also *ordinances* of divine service." Heb. 9 : 1. Then if we are right, we shall find ordinances connected with the ten-commandment covenant, given on Mt. Sinai. We find this is emphatically true of the "old covenant," as recorded in Exodus 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23d and 24th chapters, and that after the covenant was made, it was surrounded by ordinances, and enforced by "statutes and judgments" regulating the sacrificial worship of the children of Israel. The covenant was of no force without these surroundings. Like the Constitution of the United States, it would be powerless but for the statutes and judgments which are its strength and support. Should the Legislative and Executive power be abolished, the constitution would be like a law with no penalty. The *moral principles* in the Constitution would not be abolished, because they exist independently; but if this government should be changed, and become *kingly*, we should not expect that our great *memorial day*, the Fourth of July, would be kept up under the new

government. While the constitution of the new might contain all the moral principles of the old, and many more, it would be entirely out of place to retain the memorial day that was given to commemorate the adoption of those principles by the old one. All true, but it is the Passover instead of the Sabbath. See Ex. 12:11-17.

This was precisely the case with the Jewish memorial rest day, in the heart of the old covenant. When the covenant was abolished, that particular memorial day, that commemorated their deliverance from the bondage of cruel taskmasters, ran out by limitation. When the new constitution, or covenant, was adopted, that very act made the old one null and void. The *moral* principles contained in the old did not begin with the Jews, nor end with them; they are co-extensive with the human race, and ever binding. The rest day of the Jews was not given to other nations, for the obvious reason that they were not delivered from Egyptian bondage; hence, under the new covenant, confirmed by Christ, neither Gentiles nor Jews are required to rest on the seventh day of the old covenant. Then if Jesus broke the Sab. he was a sinner & condemned.

While the old covenant was in force, previous to the resurrection of Christ, all the "statutes," "judgments" and "ordinances," including all feast days, sacrifices, oblations, circumcision, passover, etc., etc., were just as binding as the Sabbath day. They could not omit any *part* of these without condemnation. The whole was a complete system, and all ended at the Cross. If one feast day, the Sabbath, was perpetual, so were all the rest by the same law.

Old covenant contained the sacrifices which all referred to Christ. Heb. 9:1-23.

All the Jewish feast days were commemorative of events in the history of that people. They had their origin and end with their dispensation. They were "perpetual" during the continuance of the Jewish polity, but continued no further.

No point can be more plainly expressed than the fact that the "ten commandments," "written and engraven on stones" (2 Cor. 3: 7), was the "old" or "first covenant." As we are now living under the "new covenant," the old must of necessity be "abolished." 2 Cor. 3: 13. If the two were just alike, there would have been no occasion for the second; or, as Paul says—"If that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8: 7.

Let us look at some points of difference between the Old and New Covenants. We have said the first was a *national* covenant with the entire body of the Israelites, designed for their social and temporal welfare; but the keeping of it did not secure their salvation. In it all there is not a single reference to Christ. It contains no command to love God nor man. It does not condemn hatred, variance, impatience, strife, wrath, envy, evil-speaking, backbiting, selfishness, pride, boasting, malice, bigamy, incest, witchcraft, cheating, sorcery, vulgar talk, drunkenness, and over twenty other sins, which are condemned in the new covenant. Which shall *we* adopt? Moses and the old covenant, or Christ and the new? In the new covenant Christ is all in all. He is the *alpha* and *omega*. Peter says—

And why? because old Sab. law not abolished. Matt. 5:19. No command against images

"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in *all* things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, that will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." Acts 3: 22, 23. In all his teachings, and in the writings of the apostles, there is not *one single command* to observe the Sabbath, or rest day, kept by the Jews. nor any command the but 1st

Working on *their* rest day is not *once* named as a sin among *Gentile* nations; either under the old or new covenant. We do not see how the Jews' memorial day could be properly kept by any other people; because the reasons assigned why the children of Israel should so arrange the *beginning* of their six working days, that the *seventh*, or rest day—the Sabbath—should represent the day of their deliverance from Egypt, could not apply to any people whose fathers were not in Egyptian bondage. Even the introduction to the ten-commandment covenant makes this point prominent, as follows: "And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of *Egypt*, out of the house of *bondage*." After saying this, he commences giving the articles of the covenant, as they appear in the decalogue. By mutual arrangement with the Lord, the children of Israel adopted this covenant, before it was "written and engraven in stones." Had it not been *mutual*, it would not have been a *covenant;* for a covenant

* nor work on 1st day.

here is the old covenant.

always implies the consent of two or more parties. That the writing on the two tables of stone was a *covenant*, the Bible positively and repeatedly afirms; therefore this point is out of the reach of controversy.

Before the covenant was made with the children of Israel, the Lord said to them, through Moses, "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people. . . . These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came, and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord." Ex. 19: 5, 7, 8.

Immediately following this promise from the people, arrangements were made between the Lord and Moses for the meeting on Mt. Sinai, where the covenant was prepared. When it was completed, with the instruction concerning its sacrifices, surrounded and protected by its statutes, judgments and ordinances, as given in Ex. 20th, 21st, 22nd, and 23d chapters, then we read in Ex. 24: 1–8: "Moses came and told the people *all* the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, *All* the words which the Lord hath said will we do." Then the sacrifice of burnt and peace offerings was made, and to confirm the whole, we read, "Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar." Ex. 24: 6. Having done this, "he took the *book of the covenant*, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, *All* the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Ex. 24: 7. Then to *seal* the whole thing, "Moses took the *blood* and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the *blood of the covenant*, which the Lord hath made with you concerning *all* these words." Ex. 24: 8. At this time, the *covenant* was not put on to the stones. The book containing "*all* these words" was called "the book of the covenant," because that was a very important part of the writing.

Paul takes up the subject and says: "Neither the *first* testament [or covenant] was dedicated without *blood*. For when Moses had spoken every precept to *all* the people according to the *law*, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and the people, saying, This is the *blood* of the *testament* [or covenant] which God hath enjoined unto you." Heb. 9: 18–20. Thus Paul shows, beyond controversy, that the "first covenant," the one that "had also ordinances of divine service" (Heb. 9: 1); the one given on Mt. Sinai, that was "dedicated" with "blood" (Heb. 9: 18), is the ten-commandment covenant. And the ark in which it was kept was called "the ark of the covenant" (Heb. 9: 4); and the stones on which it was written were called "the tables of the *covenant*." Heb. 9: 4.

It appears *certain* that the foregoing scriptures

All history of Jesus contained in Matthew-

can refer to no other covenant but the one on "the tables of stone." It is equally positive that this "first covenant," or the "old" one, was "*abolished*" when "the blood of Christ" (Heb. 9 : 14) was shed on the cross to dedicate, or confirm, the "new covenant" (Heb. 8 : 13), of which he was "the mediator." Heb. 9 : 15. Since the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, the church of "the living God" has been under the "new covenant," and its instruction, which nowhere directs the saints to keep the seventh day of the Jews.

As the "old" or "first covenant" "had also ordinances of divine service," it is certain that the ten-commandment one is meant, because there was no other one contained in ordinances. But the one that had the ordinances of divine service is the one that was "abolished" in the days of the apostles. We can see no possibility to come to any other conclusion, if we adhere to the plain teaching of the Bible on this subject.

When "the first covenant" was broken, of course the keeping of their memorial Sabbath, or rest day, which was to remind them of their covenant, was of no avail. If they did not observe all the "ordinances" that "contained," or surrounded the covenant, they lost the promised blessings. The Sabbath feast-day must be kept in a particular way, or it was broken. If it was not kept according to the prescribed *manner* in harmony with the *law* that regulated its ordinances, it was violated. For instance, those who kept the Sabbath day holy were required

to offer "on the Sabbath day *two lambs* of the first year, without spot; and two tenth deals of flour for a meat offering, mingled with oil, and the drink offering thereof; this is the burnt offering of *every Sabbath*, *beside* the continual burnt offering." Num. 28 : 9–10. This was to be perpetual. Who keeps the Sabbath day now? We do not know of a single individual. What right has any uninspired man to change the *manner* of keeping that day? Who gave him the authority? When the *manner* of keeping it is not observed, the day is not kept holy. The Lord prescribed a *particular* way, and all others were wrong. When they ceased to sacrifice their two lambs every Sabbath day, then they ceased to keep the day holy. It was no more sin to change the day, than the mode of its observance.

When the Lord gives particular directions how to do a thing, no other way will answer.+ If it is not according to the pattern, it is not accepted; hence those who pretend to be keeping the seventh day that the Jews observed, are every one of them Sabbath breakers; and consequently if their theory is true, they are all under condemnation. We do not see how one of them can be justified before the Lord. They have turned back from Christ to Moses; from the new to the old covenant; from the gospel to the law; from grace to works. Paul says: "Whosoever of you are justified by the *law*, ye are fallen from grace." Gal. 5 : 4. Again he says: "If righteousness come by the *law*, then Christ is dead in vain." Gal. 2 : 21.

This was only the law of the sacrifices, not of the Sab-

+Amen

They damn all of us-

*More than one covenant given at Sinai del.

We have shown that the first covenant was the one "written and engraven in stones," on Mount Sinai, and that it was the *only* covenant from the mount given to Moses and the children of Israel, and that that old covenant was *abolished*, being ended at the cross; hence not binding on any one now, excepting what might be incorporated into the new covenant. For proof of this we call attention to Heb. 8: 6–10, 13, as follows: —

"He is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he said, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of *Egypt*, because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. . . . In that he saith a *new covenant*, he hath made the first *old*. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is *ready to vanish away*." Heb. 9: 15. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death,

for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of an eternal inheritance."

That the "first covenant" was the one "written and engraven in stones," there seems to be no room for doubt; and the second one, the better one, was the one of which Jesus was the Mediator, and which he dedicated with his own blood, shed on the cross. Then and there the new covenant came into force. Jesus had taught its principles during his ministry, but in no case do we find him instructing his disciples to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. Why was this subject entirely omitted, if it is now as important as some seem to think?

It is sometimes said that the Lord *transferred* to the hearts of the people what was written on the stones. In such a case, it would not be "a new covenant," but the transfer of the old one, which would be contrary to the Bible, which expressly says the new covenant is "*not according* to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." As the one on the "stones" was the one made when they came out of Egypt, and the new one is "*not according*" to that, it follows the new one is not a *transfer* of the old one from the stones to the hearts of the people.

When we look at the experience under the old and new covenants, we find a marked difference. The old is like a cloudy day, the new like a clear, sunshiny one. Under the old it was chilly; under the new it is warm. The old was gloomy, the new joyful. Those who attempt to keep the old covenant are liable to become strongly sectarian, and exclusive in their feelings towards those who do not keep the seventh day. This is an ugly feature, entirely unlike the sweet spirit of Christ, and sufficient to show that the pretense of keeping the old covenant does not make any improvement in the spirit of those who go back to the institution of the Jewish people. When we look for the benefits produced by changing from the first to the seventh day, they seem to be wholly wanting. We inquire, Do such love God any better than those who keep the first day? Do they live any better? Have they more of the Spirit of Christ?

What is the response? We are sure the change is not a favorable one.

The penalty for not keeping the seventh-day Sabbath according to the law was very strict and severe. Whenever the Jews neglected their memorial day, that commemorated their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, it was equivalent to forgetting the Lord, and turning to idols. The Lord says, "Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a *sign* between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify *you*. Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto *you*. Every one that defileth it *shall surely be put to death;* for whosoever doeth *any work* therein,

P
23
5:0
25-

Can say the same of baptism—
sleep of the dead, torment.

Stoning not now inflicted for
any of the commands; hence are
abolished!

that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done, but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord; *whosoever doeth any work* in the sabbath day, he *shall surely be put to death.*" Ex. 31: 13–15. As the penalty has not been in force since the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, it follows that the commandment against working on Saturday is also abolished. To say that a law is binding after the penalty is removed from the statute book would be to talk nonsense. If there is no penalty, there is no danger of harm, even if the law be disregarded. The simple fact is this: when the old covenant was abolished, all the ordinances and divine service went with it, to be revived no more for ever.

Real penalty was always the
2nd death. This has never
been changed.

We have found it stated by the apostle, "If that first covenant had been *faultless*, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8: 7. It may be asked, Wherein was the first covenant faulty? As it was only a national covenant, designed for the common, social welfare of the Jewish people, and had no reference to Christ, or the plan of salvation through him, of course it was not sufficiently strict to fit men for eternal life. There is no evidence that it ever looked beyond the present world, or the literal Canaan, which was occupied by the children of Israel. A brief examination will show the most careless reader, that the old covenant came far short of the standard for eternal salvation, as taught by Christ. The moral precepts which the

See Heb.
9:1-23.

Jews agreed to observe, as specified in the old covenant, were all right and essential for the common welfare of any good society; and if they would not agree to abstain from such things, the Lord could not covenant to build them up as a people; hence, when they broke the covenant, he overthrew them as a nation. The mere keeping of that covenant fitted no one for salvation in the world to come. Their memorial rest day, of the fourth commandment, had no more to do with their final salvation, than circumcision, the keeping of the passover or any other feast day. The whole system of feast days, and other ceremonies, was peculiar to the Jewish people. They began, continued, and ended with them as a nation, and have no place in the new covenant, of which Christ was the Mediator.

X 34.

See Ex. 24:12; Deut. 33: 2. pas. 2:8-12,

The old covenant was not called "the Law." Like all covenants, or constitutions, it contained no penalties or rewards. Those were all specified in the law which supported the covenant. The law fixed the penalty for Sabbath breaking to be the same as for murder. A law becomes powerless and harmless when its penalty is abolished. It never continues in force beyond the existence of the penalty. The penalty for Sabbath breaking ceased at the cross of Christ, hence the Sabbath law of the fourth commandment has not been binding in the Christian dispensation.

If it be said the penalty is transferred to the world to come, and will be "the second death," then it must follow that "whosoever doeth *any* work in the Sabbath day . . . shall *surely* be put to death" the second time. This being true, none will be saved from the Christian dispensation but a few seventh-day keepers, most of whom have lived since 1844. We see no other alternative; hence the question to settle is simply and only, Is it a sin now to do any work on Saturday? Will all be condemned to die "the second death" who rest on the first instead of the seventh day? If it be admitted that there are now, and have been holy men in every generation during the Christian dispensation, who have labored as freely on Saturday as Monday, and have regarded the Lord's day — the first day — as the one on which to rest, as did the apostles, and apostolical fathers; then why should there be a division at this late day, and a separate sect raised up, in which the keeping of the Jewish memorial day, which was never once enjoined by Christ nor the apostles, must be made the test of fellowship? Is such a movement of the Lord? Nay, verily.

Men judged by light-they have. Only condemned when they know better. John 3:19; 15:24.

The Lord's day is the memorial day of the new covenant, and, so far as is known, corresponds with the first Adamic rest day. If Adam rested with his Creator, then his first day corresponded with the Lord's seventh day, for he was the last object made at the close of the six creative days. His second rest day, or Sabbath, would be the eighth, and so on, just as at the present time. It is very evident he could not rest on his seventh day, if he rested

Proof? False.

God's 7th day was Adam's 2nd day.

There are no such calculations running back to Eden. 500 B.C. are the earliest

with his Creator. Astronomical calculations give evidence that the Lord's day, now observed by Christians generally, is the one first kept in Eden. It appears quite plain that the Jews had a new rest day, not observed by other nations. In Persia, where the patriarch lived, the people turned away from the worship of the true and living God to the worshiping of the sun, and called it "Sunday." They did not lose the original rest day, but changed the mode of worship. We read in Neh. 9: 13, 14, "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest *known* unto them the holy sabbath, and commandest them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." Here is a time specified when the Lord made *known* unto the Jews *their* Sabbath, implying very clearly that it was a *new* day, not observed by their fathers. The reason given for its observance shows that it could not be applicable to any other people. They were commanded to keep that day because they were brought out of "the land of *Egypt*" through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." Deut. 5: 15. This reason for keeping the day could not be applied to any people but the *Israelites*, for no other nation had such a deliverance from Egyptian bondage. Tertullian says the seventh day was "a temporary Sabbath," to be observed only by the Jews.

False

See Exo. 20:5; 39:7.

The question arises, Does the new covenant give instruction sufficient for salvation? Of course, all must answer in the affirmative. But it does not contain a *word* requiring us to keep the seventh-day; therefore, it is not in the plan of salvation as taught by Christ and his apostles.

Nor the first-day.

The *Jewish Sabbath* of the fourth commandment was a feast day, a memorial day; and no other nation had any reason for its observance, because they were not brought out of Egyptian bondage; hence, there is none now why it should be observed by the Christian church at the present time, so long as Christ is accepted as our teacher.

The covenant on the stones was a separate thing from "the law." "The Book of the Law" contained the covenant as well as the law, and was sometimes called the "Book of the Law," and sometimes the "Book of the Covenant." After all had been written in the book, and dedicated by blood, the Lord wrote the covenant on the tables of stone. When all the words received on Mount Sinai had been spoken and written in a *book*, containing the law and the covenant, — and the covenant had been adopted and ratified, being dedicated with blood, — we find in Ex. 24: 12, the following: —

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give thee tables of stone and a law, and commandments which *I have written;* that thou mayest teach them."

This was the time when the covenant, previously written in a book, was engraved on the stones. In 2 Kings 17: 36, 37, we read: —

"But the Lord, who brought you up out of the land of *Egypt* with great power and a stretched-out arm, him shall ye fear, and him shall ye worship, and to him shall ye do sacrifice. And the *statutes*, and the *ordinances*, and the *law*, and the *commandment* which *he wrote* for you, ye shall observe to do forevermore; and ye shall not fear other gods."

Here we learn again, that the Lord first wrote the whole in a book, including "the statutes, and the ordinances, and the law, and the commandments."

N.O.

No *definite* portion of time was ever fixed as a Sabbath to be kept by all mankind. It would be impossible if the day must begin at sunset, as claimed by some. If the same particular twenty-four hours must be kept, then some would be obliged to begin at sunset, others at midnight, morning, noon, and all the intervening hours and minutes.

See Ex. 20.

Are to keep the same day, not hours nor minutes

Neither are we required to adhere to a *particular day* in all cases. For instance, when persons go around the earth east, they may very easily gain a day; and when going west they may lose a day. This has frequently happened in the case of travelers. When they started, they were both keeping the same rest day; but when they came together again, to their surprise, they were keeping separate days. Would it be a sin for them to unite on one day? Who will venture to say it would be a crime? The Lord is not as particular about some things as are some men, and much more strict about others.

All assumption
no [illegible]

In Joshua's time the "sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down a whole day." Josh. 10: 13. At this time sunset was put forward about twelve hours, thus changing the beginning of the Sabbath day at sunset, and all other days to a time twelve hours later, so that even in Palestine the same identical day would not be kept that was first observed at Mount Sinai. There is no evidence to show that the seventh-day people are keeping the same twenty-four hours first observed by the Creator at the close of creation week; indeed, we think it is certain that they are endeavoring to keep another day, never enjoined upon the Gentiles, or any of the followers of Christ, since he rose from the dead. There is no proof that the time they are keeping is any more sacred than the first day kept by Christians during the entire Christian dispensation.

But it was only one day still.

X 16, 50. 23, 57,

All the *moral* benefit derived from the keeping of the seventh day is secured in keeping the first day. All the law ever required was to work *six* days, and rest the *seventh*. The first day, now kept by Christians, more probably corresponds with the original seventh day of the week, on which our Creator rested, than the one observed by the Jews.

If this is so then he gives up his memorial day of Egypt.

Paul shows plainly that the old covenant system enjoined on the Jews is done away in Christ, and speaks as follows of his work at the cross: —

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and, having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

He goes on to say, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the *Sabbath* days, which are a *shadow* of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2: 14–17.

The *shadow* never extends beyond the *body*. No institution passed from the old to the new covenant unchanged. This remark is equally true of the seventh-day Sabbath, which was peculiar to the Jews. Hence the inevitable conclusion: —

"The Scriptures do not teach that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the decalogue is now binding upon mankind."

There is no *possible* way to sustain the seventh-day Sabbath but by proving one of the two things: (1,) That the old covenant is now binding upon all mankind; or (2,) that the fourth commandment is incorporated into the new covenant; neither of which has yet been done. The old covenant, with its ordinances, has never been binding on all mankind; but only on the Jews, who came out of Egypt. It is not binding on them now, because it is abolished. The seventh-day Sabbath is not in the new covenant, therefore it is not binding on *any one*.

The last
is true
See. Matt.
5:17-19.

We think this point has been as fully sustained by the Bible, common sense, reason, and facts, as that

the Jews were ever in Egyptian bondage, or that they made a covenant with the Lord at Mount Sinai.

HISTORICAL FACTS.

It appears certain that the seventh-day Sabbath was enjoined only upon the Jews; and that they were required to keep it to commemorate their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. This was one means by which they were kept a separate people from all other nations. The Lord said they should "not be reckoned among the nations." Num. 23: 9. The ancient Persians, where the patriarchs lived, keep Sunday. They have not lost the original day, but have changed their worship from God to the Sun. Tertullian says, "If we spend Sunday joyfully, as well as they, it is for a very different reason from the worship of the sun." *Apol.* 5. *Gent.* 17. It seems fitting that the second Adam — Christ — should rest the same day of the week as the first Adam; that is, the first day of his existence in his new life. (It is also specially proper to honor above all others the day that represents the new creation unto eternal life through a risen Savior.) As says Ignatius, "Let every one that loves Christ, keep holy the Lord's day, the queen of days, the resurrection day, the highest of days." We cannot find the least intimation in all the teachings of Christ and the apostles that Christians should keep the seventh-day Sabbath. Why are they all silent, if its keeping is so necessary for salvation as claimed by some?

But Jesus
did not
rest that
day. It
was very
busy day

We give below some historic evidence relating to the observance of the Lord's day.

In A.D. 101, Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who died only about half a dozen years after the death of the apostle John, speaks of the Lord's day familiarly and without explanation, as if everybody understood it. And he gives this title to the first day of the week exactly after the manner of the apostle himself. "Let us [Christians] no more Sabbatize," he says (that is, keep the seventh day, as the Jews did), "but let us keep the Lord's day."

He further says, "If we still continue to live according to the Jewish law, we do not confess ourselves not to have received grace. . . . Wherefore, if they who were brought up in these ancient laws come nevertheless to the newness of hope, no longer observing Sabbath, but keeping the Lord's day, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death."—*Magnesians* 3 : 1–3.

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons (A.D. 167), a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the apostles, says: "On the Lord's day every one of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God."

Tertullian, who died A.D. 245, says, "The Lord's day is the holy day of the Christian church. We have nothing to do with the Sabbath (that is, the Jewish seventh-day Sabbath). The Lord's day is the Christian's solemnity."

Barnabas, who, if not a companion of the apostles, lived in the apostolic age, says, "We [Christians] keep the eighth day [that is, the first day of the week] as a joyful holy day, on which day also Jesus rose from the dead."

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who died A.D. 397, says, "The Lord's day is sacred, or consecrated, by the resurrection of Christ."

Augustine, who died A.D. 430, says, "The Lord's day was by the resurrection declared to Christians, and from that very time it began to be celebrated as the Christian festival."

The persecutors of these Christians were accustomed to put to them this question: "*Dominicum Servasti!*"—Hast thou kept the Lord's day? If they had, they were marked as Christians. This was the badge of their Christianity. And if they said they had, and would not recant, they were put to death.

Eusebius, said to be "one of the most learned and eloquent men of the Christian church," called the "Father of Ecclesiastical History," who died A.D. 339, in his commentary on the Psalms, says of Ps. 92:—

"The Word [Christ] by the new covenant, translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the true rest, viz., the saving Lord's day; the first [day] of the light, in which the Savior of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained the victory over death. . . . On this day, which is the first day of light, and of the true sun, we assemble after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and scriptural Sabbaths, — even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world, — and do those things, according to the scriptural law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath; for we make spiritual offerings and sacrifices, which are called sacrifices of praise and rejoicing."

Theodoret, another ecclesiastical historian, who died about A.D. 460, speaking of the Ebionites, a party of Judaizing Christians, says, "They keep the Sabbath according to the Jewish law, and sanctify the Lord's day in like manner as we do." — *Hœret Fab. 2. S.* 1.

"This," says Prof. Stewart, "gives a good historical view of the state of things in the church. The zealots for the law wished the Jewish Sabbath to be observed, as well as the Lord's day; for about the latter there appears never to have been any question among any class of Christians, so far as I have been able to discover. The early Christians, one and all of them, held the first day of the week to be sacred." — *Sabbath Manual No.* 2, *pp.* 111, 126.

It appears certain that "the eighth day," "the day of the sun," "the first day of the week," and "the Lord's day," are *one* and the same day; the one observed by the primitive Christians.

Justin Martyr says, the Christians of the second century met on "the day of the sun," and did so "because on this first day God made the world, and Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead." — *Dialogue with Trypho*, *c.* 41.

He also says, "Christ rose from the dead on the eighth day," which he says, "may be called the eighth, and remain the first." — *Apol.* 1, *ad finem*.

In the third century, Cyprian represents the eighth day as both "the first after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day." — *Epist.* 64. Thus Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and Cyprian testify that these days are one.

Justin Martyr further says, "On the day called Sunday, there is a meeting in one place of all who reside whether in the towns or in the country, and the memoirs of the apostles are read. . . . The more affluent contribute of their substance as each are inclined. . . . We also assemble in common on Sunday, because . . . on the same day Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead." — *Apol.* 1, *ad finem.*

"And on the day after that of Saturn [Saturday], which is the day of the sun, having appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration." — *Apostolical Fathers*, *v.* 1, *p.* 56.

Tertullian says, the Christians solemnized the day of the sun, "the day after Saturday, in distinction from those who call this day their Sabbath." "We have nothing to do with the Sabbaths, new moons, and feasts in which God at one time took pleasure." — *De Idolatria*, *c.* 14. He says the seventh day was "a temporary Sabbath." *Adv. Jud. lib.* 4.

"The apostles introduced nothing at their own discretion, but faithfully assigned to the people the discipline which they had received from Christ." *De Prœscript. adv. Hœret. C. C.*

Epiphanius, when contending against the Ebionites, who kept both days, says, "The disciples of Christ knew very well from his conversation with them, and from his doctrine before his passion, that the Sabbath was discharged." *Contr. Ebion. Hœr.*, 30, c. 32.

Augustine declares that "the Lord's day was established by Christ;" that "there is one Lord of the Sabbath and of the Lord's day;" that it is "called the Lord's day because the Lord made it," and that it "seems properly to belong to the Lord." *Epist.* 86. *Young's Dies Domin.*, p. 71.

Mosheim, the celebrated church historian, when speaking of the first century, says, "All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout all the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers." *Maclaine's Mosheim, Cant.* 1, *part* 2, c. 4, s. 4.

History seems to settle the point, beyond all controversy, that the primitive Christians, in the first and second centuries, observed the first day, the

Lord's day, as their rest day, instead of the seventh day.

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

It is sometimes said that the Saviour, in his inaugural address, or Sermon on the Mount, teaches the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. We propose to look at the reasons given for such a conclusion.

The evidence is supposed to be contained in Matt. 5: 17–19. Turning to this Scripture we read as follows: "Think not that I am come to destroy the *law*, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the *law*, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of *these* least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

We can find no place in the Scriptures where "the *law*" means the ten commandments; much less the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. This point will be made fully apparent in another place.

What does the Savior mean, when he says, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the *law* till all be *fulfilled*"? Does he mean to say that every "jot" and "tittle" of "the law" shall be *kept* by Christians till the heaven and earth cease to exist? If this is what he means, his word has proved untrue, and this Scripture has failed; but he says, "The Scripture *cannot* be broken." John 10: 35. Then the word "*fulfilled*," in Matt. 5: 18, does not mean that the seventh-day Sabbath shall be *kept* through the Christian dispensation. In Luke 16: 16, the Savior says, "The *law* and the *prophets* were until John;" and then says, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the *law* to *fail*." Luke 16: 17. What does the word "*fail*" imply in this statement? Does it mean that the fourth commandment shall not fail to be *kept* by all Jesus' true disciples throughout the Christian era? If that was what he meant, he was mistaken, and his prophecy has failed. But let him mean that the *law* which related to him in the types should not fail to be accomplished at his first advent, and all is plain and harmonious.

Still further, Does he mean to say that since the time of John the Baptist there has been no law nor prophets? This would not be true; for Jesus gave the prophecy in the Revelation to John the Evangelist many years after the death of John the Baptist.

But it is true that "the *law* and the *prophets*" that related to *Christ*, which were to be "*fulfilled*" in him and by him at his first advent, did extend "until John." Of these he could say in truth, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Matt.

Double

Then the Dec did not pass away by his fulfilling it.

5: 17. The ten commandments have nothing in them that has the least reference to Christ; hence he did not appear to "fulfil" any part of the Decalogue; but he did come to "fulfil" all the types in "the *law*," of which he was the antitype. John was his forerunner; hence it was proper to say, "the law [of types, relating to Christ] and the prophets [that referred to Christ's first advent] were until John. Paul says," "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become *dead* to the *law* by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another; even to him who is raised from the dead." Rom. 7: 4. Then, again, there are some terms in "the law" and "the prophets" that relate to the Savior's second advent, which cannot be fulfilled "till heaven and earth pass." We do not see the least reference in these Scriptures to the keeping of the Decalogue.

Then cerem. exist.

What is the meaning of the Savior, when he says, in Matt. 5: 19, "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of *these* least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven"? To what "commandments" does he refer? He says, "one of *these least* commandments." If Mrs. White's "vision" was a true one, when she saw "the fourth [the Sabbath commandment] shone *above* them all" [Experience, p. 16], then it is not among "one of *these least*." If the Savior had said, "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of" the "least" of those ten "commandments" in the "old Covenant," the point would be plain as

Part of old law, Hence gives up the question.

to his meaning. But he says, "one of *these* least;" most clearly signifying, that by "*these* least commandments," he meant such as he was *then* giving to his disciples, and not those given more than fifteen hundred years before he appeared on the earth. The word "*these*" refers to things near at hand. We find he had commenced giving commandments to his disciples in his inaugural address, in which are found between THIRTY and FORTY commandments. Near the close of his Sermon, he says, "Whosoever heareth THESE sayings of *mine*, and *doeth* them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock." Matt. 7: 24. In his whole inaugural address he did not make the least reference to the fourth commandment. He did refer to the old law concerning murder, adultery, and swearing, but changed them very materially from what they are in the Decalogue. He also referred to other commandments in the *law* which are not in the Decalogue; but these he also altered, making them all more strict in their application. If the fourth (the seventh-day Sabbath enjoined upon the Jews) is still binding upon Christians, why did not Jesus, or the apostles, say so somewhere in the divine records? Echo answers, "Why not?" Why not the 2d

Hear Dec the colles law

Who is our mediator 1 Tim 2:5 1 John 2:1.

Jesus is the lawgiver of the New Covenant, which is the only one now binding upon his disciples. He said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Matt. 28: 18. At the transfiguration, his Father spoke from "the cloud," and said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; *hear* ye him." Matt. 17: 5.

Says Paul, "Christ is the *end* of the *law* for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10: 4. Every one of his disciples can appeal to him as their lawgiver; but he has not taught them to observe the memorial Sabbath day of the Jews. He says, "If ye keep *my commandments*, ye shall abide in my love." John 15: 10. In his last commission to his disciples, when he sent them forth to preach the gospel of the kingdom to all nations, he says, "Teaching them to *observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" Matt. 28: 20. In his last revelation to man, given to John upon the Isle of Patmos, it is said, "Blessed are they that do *his* commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life." Rev. 22: 14. But one may keep *all* of *his* commandments, without taking Saturday for his rest day; hence the keeping of that day is not one of *his* commandments, and therefore is not essential to salvation. Same of Sunday

or 1st day

Jesus said, "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." John 12: 49. Again he says, "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." John 14: 24. He says, "I and my Father are one." John 10: 30. Hence, it follows, that the commandments in the New Testament, or Cove-

God gave law thro Christ

nant, are God's commandments as truly as any that were ever given to Moses. When it is said in Rev. 14: 12, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," it simply refers to the commandments which God has given to the *Christian* church through his Son Jesus Christ. We can see no evidence that this last text quoted has the least reference to what was in the old Covenant. It might just as well be applied to any other of the commandments of God given to the children of Israel before Christ came; such as those relating to circumcision, the passover, the sacrifices, the tabernacle services, or their feast days with their holy convocations. All the instructions regulating these were just as much "the commandments of God" as any thing spoken on Mount Sinai, and just as binding under the old Covenant. But we are now under the New Covenant, and we are required to hear Jesus "in all things whatsoever he shall say." Acts 3: 22. As he has nowhere intimated that he wishes us to keep the seventh day observed by the Jews, it is certainly not enjoined upon his disciples. Here we rest, trusting sweetly in Him who keeps us in "perfect peace."

THE TWO LAWS.

It is said by those who observe the seventh-day Sabbath, that there are "two laws" in the Scripture, the "Moral Law" and the "Ceremonial Law."

Not so

We propose to examine this position, and see if it is sound. These two sets of laws are supposed to include all the law in the Bible. The "Moral Law" is said to consist in the ten commandments; then of course the "Ceremonial Law" must include the rest of the commandments. [illegible]

We will call the "Moral Law" No. 1, which is the Decalogue; and the "Ceremonial Law" No. 2. No. 1 is said to have commenced with Adam, and is eternal. No. 2 is said to extend from Moses to the crucifixion of Christ, where it was abolished. No. 1 is said to be a "complete code."

We would state our own position as follows: No. 1 the old Covenant, is abolished, because it was not a complete code, but faulty. It was not prepared as a system of salvation, but for the temporal welfare of the Jews, as a *nation;* and was not designed for any other people. not Bible either

No. 2 contains *moral* and *special* precepts. The *special* ones ended with the old Covenant, at the cross; while the moral are *perpetual.* We further state, that we do not find any Scripture that shows "the *law*" ever means the Decalogue, or old Covenant. If we find in No. 2 perpetual moral principles not found in No. 1, then the theory of the "two laws," as taught by seventh-day keepers, is spoiled for ever.

No. 1 does not contain a single precept that will be needed by the saved in the world to come. Look over the ten commandments. Will these be necessary

P. 40.

n to love God & neighb

in the kingdom of heaven? Does any one believe it? Will a holy man need a commandment telling him he must not murder, steal, swear, lie, or commit adultery? This covenant, No. 1, was applicable to a hard-hearted, blind, and sinful people, that needed a curb bit. Such were the Jews.

Every thing not found in No. 1 must belong to No. 2. Let us examine. In Luke 10 : 25–28, we read, "A certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the *law?* How readest thou? And he answering, said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live."

None of this is found in No. 1. Look again. In Matt. 22 : 36–39, we find the following: "Master, which is the great commandment in the *law?* Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great Commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

These two great commandments are not found in No. 1, — the Decalogue, or old Covenant. Then it follows that No. 1 is not "the *law*" that contains the two great commandments, on which hang all the rest. Hence the point is forever settled, that the two-law system, as taught by Sabbath-keepers, is unscriptural. There is not a word in the Bible about a "*Ceremonial* law."

The word "ceremonies" occurs but once in the entire Sacred Scriptures. There were definite regulations concerning the various typical offerings that looked forward to Christ, the antitype; but they were a part of "the law" that contains the two great commandments just noticed; but these are all in No. 2. From a careful examination we are satisfied that "the *law*" never means the ten commandments. No. 1, or the old covenant, was made out of moral precepts that were in "the law;" so that No. 1 contains a *part* of "the law;" but not the two great ones, the second of which is called "the *royal* law," as is expressed by the apostle James, as follows: —

"If ye fulfil the *royal law* according to the Scriptures, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*, ye do well." Jas. 2 : 9. We look in vain for this law in No. 1; but we find it in No. 2, as follows: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Lev. 19 : 18. In Deut. 6 : 5, we find the first of the two great commandments, as follows: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." "This is the first and great commandment" "in the *law;*" but neither this nor the second are in No. 1, — the ten commandments. Only the *true* Israelites, the holy ones, ever kept these two great ones. If all of Israel had kept them, there would have been no occasion for a cove-

Then not needed in N.T.

nant like that given on Mount Sinai. The keeping of that covenant barely prevented them from the open wickedness and idolatry practiced by the heathen nations around. It does not contain a single commandment that is not embodied in the common statutes of every civilized nation. the 2d command

See 10 C

But who would claim that the keeping of the laws of the United States will secure eternal salvation? While one could not be saved in the violation of any of its moral precepts, he must go further to secure eternal life, and keep the two great commandments in "the *law*," which are not in the old Covenant, nor in the law-books of any nation in the world. Had the Lord insisted on putting these two into the old covenant, the children of Israel, as a body, could not in honesty have said, "All the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient" (Ex. 24:7); but every individual could keep the old Covenant as it was given; therefore the whole nation made a pledge to "be obedient."

This is just what They did do

X 38.

These two great commandments are eternal in their application to all intelligent created beings, in all generations, world without end. No others are needed where they are kept; but they have no place in law No. 1. That would have been useless if these great ones had been kept by the children of Israel.

"The Law of God" includes *every* commandment given to man. The law regulating the sacrifices is just as much the law of the Lord as the two great commandments. In the Savior's childhood, his

Centr

parents "brought him to Jerusalem, . . . to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, — a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons. . . . And when they had performed all things according to the *law of the Lord*, they returned into Galilee." Luke 2:24, 39. There is no such law in No. 1.

No law abolis
then

When Paul says, "Do we then make void the* law through faith? God forbid. Yea, we establish the* law" (Rom. 3:31); does he mean No. 1, or No. 2? No. 1 is *not* the law, but the old covenant. Then he must mean a part of No. 2. By referring to the preceding verse (30th) we see his point more clearly. He says, "Seeing it is one God which shall JUSTIFY the circumcision by *faith*, and uncircumcision through *faith*." It will be seen that he is speaking of the common law of *justification* for the circumcised and uncircumcised, and says it is "by *faith*." But faith does not make void the two great commandments in the law.

When Paul says, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the *law*" (Heb. 7:12), he means that part of the law of God relating to the priesthood. It is one of the *special* parts of the law that was *fulfilled* by Christ at his first advent. See Matt. 5:17.

It is certain that law No. 2 has *essential* moral principles that are not contained in No. 1. No. 2 has also *special* things that were fulfilled by Christ

---

* These articles are not in the original.

9th com., or 6 com

at the cross. It is certain that law No. 1 passes over sins condemned by law No. 2. Paul says, "We know that what things soever the *law* saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped." Rom. 3 : 19. Suppose one is talking hatred about his neighbor, No. 1 would not stop his mouth: No. 2 would. Suppose one does not love God nor his neighbor, No. 1 will not condemn 2d him: No. 2 would. We begin to see why the Scriptures say, when speaking of "the *two covenants*," and particularly of the first "one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage" (Gal. 4 : 24), that "if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8 : 7. No. 2 contains the great commandments of the new covenant in Christ. No. 1 — the Decalogue, the old covenant — was not a complete system for all mankind. All the *moral* principles in No. 1 are based on the two great commandments in No. 2; hence, if No. 2 should be abolished, No. 1 must be also of necessity.

Let us look further at the points of difference between law No. 2 and law No. 1, and we shall see still more clearly where No. 1 was faulty.

No. 2 condemns wrath: No. 1 does not. No. 2 condemns strife: No. 1 does not. No. 2 condemns envy, variance, emulation, backbiting, evil surmisings, evil speaking, scolding, pride, selfishness, busybodies, whisperers, boasters, and the heady; but No. 1 does not. No. 2 condemns fierceness, an unforgiving spirit, unthankfulness, highmindedness, impatience, malice, unmercifulness, and those who have but a form of godliness, and are despisers of those that are good: No 1 does not. No. 1 does not condemn witchcraft, pleasure-loving, heresies, revelings, vulgar talk, loving the world, seditions, uncleanness, nor drunkenness: No. 2 condemns all these.

half of list not in the Gk Text, much of it in the Bible

With these facts before us shall we still claim that the Decalogue (No. 1) is a "complete system for all time"? It is very evident that Christ was "the Mediator of a *better* covenant" (Heb. 8 : 6), because the old one was not "faultless;" "and for this cause he is the Mediator of the new testament." Heb. 9 : 15. Under which are we now living? The *new*. But the Sabbath law of the old covenant cannot be found in the new. Then is it binding on those who follow Christ? The same argument that put the seventh-day Sabbath of the *Jews* into the new covenant, would also introduce the passover, circumcision, Jewish worship, with all their feast-days and ceremonies. False They were all peculiarities of the old covenant, and were a yoke of bondage. Gal. 4 : 24. Let those who are in Christ "stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. 5 : 1).

MARK OF THE BEAST.

In the revelation given to St. John by Jesus, we find frequent reference to a certain beast and his *mark*. Beasts in symbolical prophecy represent political powers. The one that gives the *mark* is the two-horned beast of Revelation 13. The leopard beast, described in the first part of the chapter, most certainly represents the political powers that supported the church at Rome. When that had accomplished its terrible bloody work, John saw in vision the two-horned beast "coming up" to do his work, which evidently continues to the coming of Christ. As the two horns were short, like a lamb's, they indicate the beast will continue but a short time; yet his power will be strong. This beast represents a power specially anti-christian; and whoever receives the mark of the beast must thereby deny Christ: for there is no salvation for those who accept that mark; their portion is in the lake of fire and brimstone. The mark must be some sign, badge, or number, by which the wearer will show that he accepts and indorses the infidel principles of the government. This appears to be the last test devised by Satan, and presented to the people for acceptance, before the appearing of the Son of man.

We do not now propose to show when, where, or how this beast will be manifested, but to examine a theory that has been put forth by some in relation to

Second statement

what will constitute the mark. It is this: It is said the mark of the beast will consist in keeping the Lord's day, instead of the seventh day observed by the Jews under the old covenant. One thing is certain, the Scriptures teach no such thing, nor even hint that such will be the mark; hence the proof must come from some other source than the Bible. What is not taught in the Sacred Scriptures is not Bible doctrine. When we inquire for the reason of the belief that keeping the Lord's day will constitute the mark of the beast, we find it consists mainly in the visions of one who professes to be a prophetess of the Lord. But when her visions are examined, they are found to contradict facts, to contradict themselves, and the Bible; hence the inevitable conclusion that they do not come from the Lord. For this reason, they are of no weight in helping us to ascertain what will constitute the mark of the beast.

Prove that Sunday is Lord day

To those who expect that keeping the Lord's day will constitute the mark of the beast, we would say, "Come, let us reason together." (1.) It is a fact that the Christians in the first century did observe the Lord's day — the first day — as a day of rest and worship, set apart to commemorate the resurrection of Christ; hence all such honored the Lord, and accepted him as their resurrection and life, their all in all, their Savior and Redeemer. In doing this they honored the Father. Therefore keeping the Lord's day in the first century did not constitute the mark of the beast, but showed a special love and sympathy

No

for Christ, and trust in him for salvation. None but Christians observed it as the Lord's day.

(2.) This same day has been observed by the faithful disciples of Jesus for the same reason, from the first century to the present, and it has not yet become a cursed day; so that he who keeps it in honor of his Lord, does by so doing receive the mark of the beast, and thus fit himself for a place among the most wicked. The more one loves the Lord, the more he delights to honor his day, that commemorates the beginning of the new creation unto eternal life and glory. The creation of man for temporal life was a great event; but when our Lord rose from the dead, and then opened the way to life eternal, it was an event still more wonderful.

No more than his death

(3.) Does it look reasonable, — after the dear friends of our Lord have kept and honored his day for eighteen hundred years, and enjoyed his special blessings century after century, as they have met on that day for his worship, working as freely on Saturday as any other day without feeling any condemnation, — that all at once the keeping of this same day, for the same reason, by those who love Christ, and accept him as their only Savior, should by so doing receive the mark of the beast, or government, that utterly denies Christ as a Savior? Does this look reasonable? Is it scriptural? Has it any foundation in the word of the Lord? Nay, verily. Shall we heed visions that lead to such strange conclusions, and only serve to divide the flock of God? We

Appeal to sympathy

Same with sleep of dead

think it is high time that every true friend of Jesus should lift his warning voice against such heretical visions and teachings, and turn his back on them for ever.

KEEP THE COMMANDMENTS.

When the Savior was on the mount of transfiguration, a voice came from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." Matt. 17: 5. Jesus says, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." John 15: 14. In his closing instruction to his disciples, the Savior said: "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28: 20. In Rev. 21: 13, 14, Jesus says: "I am Alpha and Omega. . . . Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life." Again he says, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." John 15: 10. Many such Scriptures might be quoted to show the fact that the keeping of our Savior's commandments secure to us all the blessings and promises of the new covenant or testament. The commandments of Christ are the commandments of God. He says, "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." John 14: 24. As the Father has instructed us to hear him, and as by obeying him we become his "friends," and as by keeping "his

how can Christ be a law giv

commandments" we "may have right to the tree of life," it follows that what he has commanded is all-sufficient for salvation. Hence, when it is said in Revelation 14: 12, "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," there is no evidence that the passage just quoted has the least reference to any commandment not found in the New Testament.

SACRED TIME.

Sunset Time,

It is claimed by seventh-day Sabbath-keepers, that there are twenty-four hours of *sacred time* that were set apart for rest by our Creator, at the close of the creation week; and that they began at *sunset* at the close of the sixth day, and continued till the sunset of the seventh day. If this is true, then no part of the other six days can be included in the "sacred time." If these *particular* twenty-four hours are sacred, and of universal application to all mankind, then they are the *only* ones to be observed in all parts of the world. If this is the correct view of the case, it follows, that when it is sunset at the place where our Creator began his rest day, after six days' labor, every person, all over the world, should then begin his rest day, or else he is breaking the Sabbath by working in "sacred time." All should rest at the same time in the whole universe. The fact that some were a few miles away from the garden of Eden would not give them the liberty to work during the sacred twenty-four hours. It would be a strange way of observing the Sabbath in a large manufacturing establishment, if a large part of the hands should conclude to keep at work in their respective rooms, because they did not happen to be in the same apartment where the overseer was keeping the Sabbath. Would they not be guilty of Sabbath-breaking just as truly as though they were in his room? Suppose our Creator was *now* resting with Adam in the garden of Eden, and we were at work here, should we not be breaking the Sabbath day, provided those particular twenty-four hours which he is keeping are sacred time? If they are sacred there, they are everywhere, at the same time; so, that, if we are at work when he is resting, because we do not happen to be at the same spot, it is like the case just supposed in the manufacturing establishment. When the overseer keeps the Sabbath, all the rest should keep it with him; or else they violate the day. So, when the Creator's rest day commences at head-quarters, in Eden, everybody on the earth should rest with him, if those particular twenty-four hours are "sacred time." We can see no way to avoid this conclusion. Then it must follow that all are Sabbath-breakers, excepting those who keep the day that lies between sunset and sunset in the land of Eden. Those who do this should be careful to ascertain precisely the hour of sunset in Palestine every Sabbath day in the year, and then begin to keep the "sacred twenty-four hours" during which our Creator rested. If they do not do this, they do not keep the day he kept. Every one who contends for a specific sacred day should adopt this plan, or forever be silent on the subject.

The idea that some have advanced, that the supposed "sacred twenty-four hours" keep continually revolving around the earth, like a planet about the sun, is absurd. Such persons claim, that when the *sunset* reaches us, then the beginning of those particular "sacred twenty-four hours" have arrived for the commencement of the Sabbath. Suppose we live, as many do, where the days are a week or a month long? Should they be regulated by the *sunset* to begin their Sabbath day?

The whole difficulties are all remedied, harmonized, made simple, and consistent with all the teachings of the Bible, and the welfare of the human race, spiritually and socially, if men will follow the example of their Creator, — work six days, of twenty-four hours each, and then rest the next twenty-four hours. This meets all the demands of God's law, excepting in the case of the children of Israel, who were specially instructed to observe a particular seventh day as their rest day, which should commemorate the day of their deliverance from Egypt.

Of course, the original rest day, kept in Eden, would be the one to be observed by those who lived there; but, after a time, the nations departed from the Lord, and ceased to worship *him* on their rest day, and changed to the worship of the *sun:* hence they called the same day of rest, which had come

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

down to them from creation, "Sunday;" the very day, so far as known, that Christians now keep in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. The Jewish rest day was peculiar to them, hence we read the Lord made "*known* unto them" the "holy Sabbath . . . by the hand of Moses." Neh. 9 : 14. This clearly implies that the Sabbath given to them after they came out of Egypt was one *unknown* to them before. The reason is obvious. There had not been any occasion before to commemorate that day. The observance of this memorial day helped to keep them separate from other nations. When asked why they kept it, they must answer, Because our "God brought" us out "of Egypt" "through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; *therefore* the Lord" thy "God commanded" us "to keep" this "Sabbath day" to commemorate the wonderful event. Deut. 5 : 15. With the exception of the Jewish people, whoever works six twenty-four hours, starting either at sunset, midnight, morning, or noon, and rests the next twenty-four hours, complies with all the requirements in the Scripture. Whoever does this follows the example of his Creator, and thereby acknowledges him as the One who made the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh.

53

When the old covenant, with its ordinances, closed up at the cross, then its memorial rest day ended with it, and the apostles and early Christians adopted for their rest day the one that commemorated the resurrection of Christ, the most important event that had transpired since the creation of man. As we have before stated, there are good reasons for believing that, for eighteen hundred years, the Christian Church has been keeping the day that corresponds with the original rest day in Eden, — the *First* day.

It has sometimes been said that the pope changed the day. We can find no proof that this statement is true. Indeed, the Catholics claim that the keeping of the Lord's day started from the apostles, and claim the apostolic "traditions" for its support. Paul says, "Brethren, stand fast in the *traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." 2 Thess. 2 : 15.

Others have affirmed that Constantine changed the day, about A.D. 325, when he began to protect Christianity. Instead of this, he only *confirmed* the practice of the Christians in keeping the Lord's day. This fact shows that the day had been kept long before Constantine's time. As Mosheim says, when speaking of the *first* century: "All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Savior arose from the dead, for the solemn custom of public worship. This pious custom . . . was founded on the express appointment of the apostles." Paul says, "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Rom. 14 : 6.

When a day is set apart to commemorate some important transaction, those who honor the event will regard the day. The American people love to celebrate the Fourth of July, because it is the memorial day of their declaration of independence; but the British nation feels no special reason for honoring the day. While we may regard the birthday of Washington, the English honor the birthday of their esteemed Queen. The Lord's day is kept to commemorate the resurrection of Christ, on which all our hopes of future life depend. As the Jews reject Christ as a Savior, they do not regard the "*Lord's* day." If they *should* honor the day, they would be admitting he was the true Messiah, which would spoil their Judaism. He who loves Jesus most will be most inclined to honor the day that commemorates his resurrection. "He that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it."

X 57,

It is a well-known fact, that criminals often date their downward career from the time they began to disregard the Lord's day. They soon lost respect for the Lord's requirements, and plunged still deeper into iniquity. He who refuses to make the first day his rest day, and unites with the Jews in keeping the seventh day, virtually joins with the enemies of Christ, and dishonors the day of the Lord. We are thankful that we feel no inclination to return back under the old covenant, to unite with the Jews, who said of Jesus, "Crucify him;" but we do delight to honor the day when he rose triumphant from the grave, and thus secured eternal life for all the saints.

Had he not risen, we should have no hope of a new creation. The event that opens the way for "*eternal* life" is greater than the one that produced only temporal existence. In keeping the *Lord's* day, we honor God who raised his dear Son to life from the dead; and we honor Christ as our resurrection and life, our all in all.

As the keeping of the "Lord's day" is a *voluntary* act, of course those who do not "regard" him will not be inclined to observe the day. Those who choose to begin their week's labor on the Lord's day, then work six days and rest the seventh, get the same benefit, so far as *rest* is concerned, as those who end their week of work on Saturday and rest on the First day; but the seventh-day man is only regarding the day that the Israelites came out of *Egypt*, while he who observes the Lord's day is honoring the deliverance of the Son of God from the power of death, and the consequent deliverance of all his children. Which is the greater event? The answer is easy. Let us regard the "Lord's day."

To our own mind the whole matter is very plain, and we are perfectly at *rest* on the subject. We delight in regarding the day to the *Lord*, and have no fears that it will ever become "the mark of the beast," as taught in Mrs. White's visions.

"WITHIN THE VEIL."

It has been claimed by some who pretend to keep Saturday for the Sabbath, that Christ did not go into the Holy of Holies till the tenth day of the seventh month, in 1844. The only evidence for this, so far as we know, depends upon the visions of Ellen White. In addition, an attempt has been made to show that the expression "within the veil" may not necessarily mean in the Holy of Holies; but we think the proof of such a position is entirely wanting in the Scriptures. In Heb. 6: 18-20, Paul speaks of those "who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner *is* for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." Heb 9:3, Second veil,

This passage positively affirms that Christ had entered "within the veil" in Paul's day. He says, "Whither [that is, *within the veil*] the forerunner *is* for us entered." There is no room for doubt but this inspired apostle declared that, when he wrote, Jesus was at that time "*within* the veil." The hope of the Christian reaches to the same place, because it is centered in Christ.

Let us now look carefully at the Bible teaching as to the meaning of the expression, "within the veil." We would state here, that we believe it *always* means in "the most holy place," or Holy of Holies. In Exodus we read:—

"And thou shalt hang up the veil under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither *within the* *veil the ark of the testimony;* and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat upon the ark of the testimony in the *most holy place.* And thou shalt set the table *without the veil*, and the candlestick." Ex. 26: 33–35. Here we learn that "the ark of the testimony" was "within the veil," which was "the most holy place."

There is no ground for controversy on this point. The Scripture is positive and plain. The high priest went "alone once every year" "within the veil." Heb. 9: 7. But "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands; but into *heaven itself*, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. 9: 24. Is not God in the Holy of Holies? Most certainly. As Paul said, "Christ is . . . *now within the veil*" when the apostle wrote. He goes on to say, "After he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever," he sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10: 12. Where did he sit down? "On the right hand of God," "in the presence of God," "within the veil." Hence any "vision" that contradicts these plain Scriptures cannot be from God the Holy Spirit; and all such visions should be rejected by those who believe the Bible. In Lev. 16: 2, and 21: 1–3, we read:—

"And the Lord said unto Moses, speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place *within the veil* before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark." "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Command the children of Israel, that they bring unto thee pure oil olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamps to burn continually *without the veil* of the testimony, in the tabernacle of the congregation."

We would say again, that the expression "within the veil," always means in the Bible, "the most holy place;" therefore, as Christ had entered "within the veil" in Paul's day, he did not wait till the tenth day of the seventh month, in 1844, before he entered into "the most holy place," as declared in "the visions" to which we have referred.

CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY.

In Daniel 8: 13, 14, we read, "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the *sanctuary* and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the *sanctuary* be cleansed."

From this Scripture, we learn that the *sanctuary* cannot be cleansed till the close of the twenty-three hundred days, which mark the duration of the time covering the whole length of the vision. The vision embraces the ram, representing the Medo-Persian kingdom; the rough goat symbolizing the kingdom of Grecia; and other political changes which were to take place during the fulfillment of this prophecy.

The cleansing of the sanctuary appears to be the last link in the great chain of events which must transpire before the saints take the promised kingdom.

We now inquire for the meaning of the word sanctuary, as used in the text under consideration. It has different significations in the Bible. In Heb. 9 : 2, it refers to a part of the tabernacle; in 1 Chron. 22 : 19, a part of the temple; in Ps. 114 : 2, by a figure of speech, Judah was called the Lord's sanctuary; and in Isa. 8 : 14, the Lord is represented as a sanctuary. We think the sanctuary mentioned in Dan. 8 : 13, 14, which is to be cleansed at the end of the twenty-three hundred days, cannot be the one referred to in any of the passages just noticed. The tabernacle and temple have been long destroyed, and cannot be cleansed. Judah has not been cleansed, and the word cannot apply to the Lord, for he has never been unclean.

Inasmuch as the twenty-three hundred days give the length of time necessary to fulfill the vision; and as the events specified in the vision required many centuries for their accomplishment, it follows that the days were not literal, but symbolical, like the prophecy of which they form a part. Hence, we understand the period necessary to measure the length of the vision, which began with the "pushing" of the ram, is one of twenty-three hundred years (each day representing a year), at the end of which the sanctuary shall be cleansed.

The word "sanctuary" is first found in the Bible in Ex. 15 : 17, where Moses says to the Lord, concerning Israel, "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in; in the *sanctuary*, O Lord, which thy hands have established." Says David, in Ps. 78 : 54, "And he brought them to the border of his sanctuary, even to this mountain, which his right hand had purchased." We have now found a sanctuary that could be trodden down by the wicked, and be cleansed from all the effects of the curse. When referring to the time allotted to the scattering of Israel, Jesus says, "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be *trodden down* of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Luke 21 : 24. This is the very place to which the Lord brought the children of Israel, when he led them out of Egypt to his sanctuary.

From the plain teaching of the Scriptures, we are satisfied that this sanctuary — the land occupied by the first Adam — is the one to be cleansed by the second Adam, when he shall come to set up his kingdom. This sanctuary is to become its capital, where the throne of the King of kings will be located. But before he shall be seated upon his throne, in the kingdom of heaven, he will "send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; . . . and *then* shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom [or sanctuary] of their Father." Matt. 13: 41, 43. *Then* will be the time when all the saints who were raised from the dead at the coming of Christ, and caught up together with the living Christians "to meet him in the air," till the sanctuary should be cleansed, shall return with Jesus to commence the glorious millennial reign *with* their Redeemer. Then, as saith the prophet Isaiah, "The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my *sanctuary;* and I will make the place of my feet glorious." Isa. 60: 13.

According to Mrs. White's "visions," the sanctuary to be "cleansed" at the end of the twenty-three hundred days is in heaven; and that Christ began the work on the tenth day of the seventh month, A.D. 1844, at which time she claims the twenty-three hundred days of Dan. 8: 14, came to an end. Query: Where is the proof, aside from Mrs. White's visions, that heaven contains a filthy sanctuary that needed any cleansing, because it had been "trodden under foot" for twenty-three hundred days (years)? Who were they who defiled the sanctuary in heaven during this period? How came they there? Heb 10:29. Dan 8:10.

Heb 8:1-5
9:1-11.
23,24.

It appears evident from the prophecy in Dan. 8: 13, 14, that the power which trod down "the sanctuary and the host," was the Roman, called "the transgression of desolation." How did "the transgression of desolation" get into the sanctuary in heaven to defile it, so that it needed cleansing?

The heavenly sanctuary, according to Mrs. White's own showing, is the Holy of Holies, where God has his throne. Is it reasonable to suppose, that for twenty-three hundred years he has allowed the Roman transgression of desolation to defile "heaven itself"? the most holy place, till the tenth day of the seventh month, A.D. 1844? Visions that teach such things need no further refutation then their mere announcement.

If the twenty-three hundred days (years) ran out in 1844, and the sanctuary was then cleansed, why is "the host"—the church—still trodden under foot? The time for treading down the "host" ends with the twenty-three hundred days, when "the transgression of desolation" shall cease to tread down the sanctuary, which is the *land* promised to Abraham. "The sanctuary and the host" are still trodden under foot; therefore the twenty-three hundred days are not yet ended, nor the sanctuary cleansed.

"VISIONS AND PROPHECIES."

It is a well-known fact, that, when a demon has control of his medium, he can cause his subjects to see any thing he pleases. Like a mesmerizer, he has only to form a mental picture of any thing existing, or any imaginary object, when that mental picture in the demon's mind appears to his medium as a *real* object. In this way they deceive those under their control.

In the visions of Mrs. White, published at Topsham, Me., Jan. 31st, 1849, she says, —

"I was taken off in vision to the most holy place, where I saw Jesus still interceding for Israel. On the bottom of his garment was a bell and a pomegranate. . . . A decree went forth to slay the saints, which caused them to cry day and night for deliverance. This was the time of Jacob's trouble. Then all the saints cried out with anguish of spirit, and were delivered by the voice of God. The 144,000 triumphed. Their faces were lighted up with the glory of God. Then I was shown a company who were howling in agony. On their garments was written in large characters — thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting. I asked who this company were? The angel said, 'These are they who have once kept the Sabbath and have given it up.' I heard them cry with a loud voice, 'We have believed in thy coming, and taught it with energy.' . . . I saw the state of some who stood on present truth, but disregarded the vision, — the way God had chosen to teach, in some cases, those who erred from Bible truth. I saw that in striking against the visions they did not strike against the worm, the feeble instrument that God spake through, but against the Holy Ghost."

Again she says, "The Lord has given me a view of other worlds. Wings were given me, and an angel attended me from the city to a place that was bright and glorious. The grass of the place was living green, and the birds there warbled a sweet song. The inhabitants of the place were of all sizes; they were noble, majestic and lovely. . . .

"Then I was taken to a world which had seven moons. There I saw good old Enoch, who had been translated. On his right arm he bore a glorious palm, and on each leaf was written victory. Around his head was a dazzling white wreath, and leaves on the wreath, and in the middle of each leaf was written purity. . . . I asked him if this was the place he was taken to from the earth? He said, 'It is not, but the city is my home, and I have come to visit this place.'"

In a vision of Mrs. White, March 24th, 1849, she says, "I was shown that the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ, relating to the shut door, could not be separated." She had visions showing that the door of mercy was closed to sinners on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844. The witnesses to this fact are abundant. She was then shown that "the door was opened in the most holy place," at that time, and then Jesus entered it for the first time. She was then shown that "The mediation of Jesus was finished in the holy place of the sanctuary in 1844. Then Jesus rose up and shut the door in the Holy Place." She goes on to say, "The midnight cry was finished at the seventh month, 1844." "My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time for their

?

salvation is past." *Views of Ellen G. White, pp.* 24–27.

"Visions and prophecies" should be received with great caution, as they are a means by which Satan attempts to deceive people in these last days, and by which he has often led them into error and darkness. This is most apparent in Spiritualism, which is crowded with "visions and prophecies." From the early ages of the world to the present time, Satan has been producing counterfeit "visions and prophecies," with which to seduce the Lord's children; and it is not reasonable to suppose that in these last days he has quietly retired from his deceitful work. He has had great success in this business, and often led honest souls to follow his false "visions and prophecies," and thus form a new religious party. This was the case with Joanna Southcott, Ann Lee, Joseph Smith, Swedenborg, and many others that might be named.

MRS. WHITE'S VISIONS.

The question here arises, Is Mrs. Ellen White, of Battle Creek, Mich., a true prophetess of the Lord, and are her visions from him? Recent developments demand that this question should be candidly and fully answered. If the Lord has chosen her as a prophetess to lead his people in these last days, the fact should be known in all the world, and all the saints should listen to her voice, and rely upon her visions; but if she is a false prophetess and visionist, the disciples of Christ should be faithfully warned against putting any confidence in her visions and prophecies. The interests involved in this matter demand a thorough investigation. We would that this unpleasant duty could have fallen upon some other person; but we feel assured that the Lord would not have us remain silent on this subject any longer. It is well known that Mrs. White's visions and prophecies are indorsed by the Seventh-day Adventists, whose head-quarters are at Battle Creek, Mich. They have voted in conferences the acceptance of her as a true prophetess of the Lord. Of course this vote does not settle the matter. The True Israelites would vote that Joanna Southcott was a prophetess of the Lord; the Mormons would vote that Joseph Smith was a prophet of the Lord; and Swedenborgians would vote the same of Swedenborg; and so on, to the end of the chapter.

We think all candid, Bible-loving people will be ready to admit that prophecies and visions given by the Lord are invariably true. He makes no mistakes, and teaches no false doctrine. Prophecies and visions from him do not contradict facts; they do not contradict themselves, nor the Sacred Scriptures. Then it follows, that if it can be clearly shown that Mrs. White's visions and prophecies do contradict facts, themselves, and the Bible, the conclusion will be inevitable, that they do not come from the Lord, and are therefore of no more consequence than those from any other false prophet.

In the "Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath," July 2d, and 9th, 1874, we find articles headed "Visions and prophecies," from which we make some extracts. Before doing so, we wish to say, that in these articles it is claimed that the "Seventh-day Adventists" are the "remnant church" referred to in Revelation, "the last of the true church." They make this claim, because they "keep all the ten commandments," and "have the spirit of prophecy in exercise among them."

The writer says, "In regard to the spirit of prophecy, it is a remarkable fact, that from the first of their existence as a people, Seventh-day Adventists have claimed that it has been in active exercise among them. . . . It is a fact, that for nearly thirty years, Mrs. Ellen G. White—the wife of Eld. James White, both of them pioneers in this movement—has had visions which are generally regarded by those in sympathy with this church as being from the Lord; and it is freely admitted that they have exerted a large influence in making Seventh-day Adventism what it now is."

We would also say it is a fact, that many honest Christian men and women who once had confidence in her visions have none at all at present. Why is this? We shall see soon.

Let us apply the Bible test to Mrs. White's visions: "When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the

prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him." Deut. 18:22. When we try Mrs. White's "Visions and Prophecies" by this rule, we find the word "*tekel*" written against them. Take for instance her vision and prophecy which declared the door of mercy was closed on the tenth day of the seventh month in 1844. Had that vision been from the *Lord* it would have been *true;* and no sinner could have obtained pardon since. Was that vision and prophecy true? The whole Christian world, angels, Christ and God would thunder forth an emphatic No! Then the vision was not from the Lord. She also had a vision showing that Christ did not go within the veil, into the holy of holies in the presence of his Father, till the tenth day of the seventh month, in 1844; whereas the Bible positively teaches that Christ was "within the veil," in the holy of holies, in the presence of God, when the apostles were living.

We now see why many honest Christian people, who once had confidence in Mrs. White's visions, have given them up as unworthy of their confidence; and, if facts were fully known, we believe all others would do the same. There are three reasons why they cannot be accepted as coming from the Lord:—

1. *They contradict* FACTS.
2. *They contradict* THEMSELVES.
3. *They contradict the* BIBLE.

Either of these reasons existing would afford *positive* proof that they do not come from the Lord;

but the evidence is abundant to show that they all apply to her visions, and that they are no more reliable than those of Joanna Southcott, Ann Lee, Swedenborg, or those coming from the Spiritualist mediums of the present time. We are bold to say, that *not a single prophecy or vision of hers can be produced that may not have been given by a demon.*

We do not doubt Mrs. White's honesty and sincerity; and the same could be said of Joanna Southcott or Swedenborg, and many others that might be named, who have had "visions and prophecies." We have not, and have never had, a particle of unkind feeling toward Mrs. White or her supporters; but when we see honest people being led astray by the cunning artifices of Satan, we feel it to be a Christian duty to sound a note of alarm, hoping, that by so doing, we may be instrumental in keeping some from falling into the snare.

Mrs. White had her first visions and prophecies in 1844–5. At that time she was living in Maine, her native State. She was then unmarried, and her maiden name was Ellen Harmon. Her visions and prophecies were well known, and much talked about at that time. Many believed them at first, who afterwards were forced to reject them, when it was fully shown that they were contradictory, and opposed to facts. These points may be as clearly proved by the most reliable witnesses, as that she ever had any visions, or ever uttered any prophecies.

We have only room for a few testimonies among the multitude that might be given.

Bro. I. C. Wellcome, of Yarmouth, Me., a faithful minister of Christ, says, "I was often in meeting with Ellen G. Harmon [now Mrs. White, Ed.] and James White in 1844 and '45. I several times caught her while falling to the floor, — at times when she swooned away for a vision. I have heard her relate her visions of these dates. Several were published on sheets, to the effect that all were lost who did not indorse the '44 move, that Christ had left the throne of mercy, and all were sealed that ever would be, and no others could repent. She and James taught this one or two years. Recently, in her published visions, called 'Testimony,' her visions differ widely, and directly contradict flatly her former ones."

Bro. Israel Damman, of Corinna, Me., another faithful minister of Christ, and his devoted wife, testify as follows: "We were formerly acquainted with Mr. and Mrs. White, and for a time had confidence in her visions, but for a good many years have had none at all. When we saw that they conflicted one with another, we renounced them altogether, and betook ourselves to the word of the Lord.

"It has been some twenty years or more since we were associated with Mrs. W.; but we remember very perfectly that her first visions or vision was told both by herself and others (especially by Mrs. W.)

in connection with the preaching of the '*shut door*,' and went to substantiate the same. While under that influence, and preaching the visions, she, in vision, saw N. G. Reed and I. Damman, in the kingdom, in an immortal state, and crowned. After that, she saw them finally lost. How could both be true? *I* think one was just as true as the other, and that God never told her any such thing."

Bro. John Megquier, Saco, Me. (formerly of West Poland, Me.), a farmer, noted for his upright character and Christian integrity, says,—

"We well know the course of Ellen G. White, the visionist, while in the State of Maine. About the first visions that she had were at my house in Poland. She said God had told her in vision that the door of mercy had closed, and there was no more chance for the world, and she would tell who had got spots on their garments; and those spots were got on by questioning her visions, whether they were of the Lord or not. Then she would tell them what to do, or what duty to perform, to get into favor with God again. Then God would show her, through a vision, who was lost, and who was saved in different parts of the State, according as they received or rejected her visions. She could put herself under their influence, just the same as any mesmeric person would.

"The Advent people in the State of Maine have no confidence in her course nor visions; and she has but a few followers in this State, which is her native State, but she has succeeded in raising up quite a number of followers in some of the Western States. They will go into new places, and like to go best where the Advent doctrine has been introduced. They will preach the Advent doctrine first; then will introduce the seventh-day; and last, and most important, they must receive Ellen with all of her different messages, which is a perfect snare of the Devil. If persons would only take pains to read the history of Ann Lee, the founder of the Shakers, they would see a perfect similarity between the two. Ann commenced to form the Shaker Society through visions, which, she claimed, were from God. She got some followers, and they have increased to quite a large society; and some of them still have visions, directing what to eat and wear, just the same as Ellen does for her followers. No doubt it is one of the last-day signs, and a perfect snare of the devil. . . . There are a large number of living witnesses that can testify to these things.

"JOHN MEGQUIER."

The following is from Sr. L. S. Burdick, San Francisco, Cal., formerly wife of Elder John Howell, an able and devoted minister of Christ, who lived in Maine when Mrs. White was there having visions. Bro. and Sr. Howell were well acquainted with Mrs. White. Sr. Howell has held her head in her lap while she was having her visions. Sr. Burdick says,—

"I became acquainted with James White and Ellen Harmon (now Mrs. White) early in 1845. At the time of my first acquaintance with them they were in a wild fanaticism, — used to sit on the floor instead of chairs, and creep around the floor like little children. Such freaks were considered a mark of humility. They were not married, but traveling together. Ellen was having what was called visions: said God had shown her in vision that Jesus Christ arose on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, and shut the door of mercy; had left for ever the mediatorial throne; the whole world was doomed and lost, and there never could be another sinner saved. She very soon pretended to see that Saturday must be kept for the Sabbath. Her visions were something new, and there seemed to be at first no decided opposition to them in the different churches where they traveled. They caused a great deal of discussion and excitement, and all seemed disposed to investigate. But, after a little while, her visions began to conflict one with the other. It was ascertained by myself and others who saw her in vision, that she could not only throw herself into vision when she chose (this she confessed), but that James White could control them, and bring her out when he pleased.

"There were also many failures. She pretended God showed her things which did not come to pass. At one time she saw that the Lord would come the second time in June, 1845. The prophecy was discussed in all the churches, and in a little 'shut-door paper' published in Portland, Me. During the summer, after June passed, I heard a friend ask her how she accounted for the vision? She replied that 'they told her in the language of Canaan, and she did not understand the language; that it was the next September that the Lord was coming, and the second growth of grass instead of the first in June.' September passed, and many more have passed since, and we have not seen the Lord yet. It soon became evident to all candid persons, that *many* things must have been 'told her in the language of Canaan,' or some other which she did not understand, as there were repeated failures. I could mention many which I knew of myself.

"Once, when on their way to the eastern part of Maine, she saw that they would have great trouble with the wicked, be put in prison, etc. This they told in the churches as they passed through. When they came back, they said they had a glorious time. Friends asked if they had seen any trouble with the wicked, or prisons? They replied, None at all. People in all the churches soon began to get their eyes open, and came out *decidedly* against her visions; and, just as soon as they did so, she used to see them 'with spots on their garments,' as she expressed it. I was personally acquainted with several ministers, whom she saw landed in the kingdom with 'Oh! such *brilliant crowns*, FULL of stars.' As soon as they took a stand against the visions, she saw them 'doomed, damned, and lost for ever, without hope.'

"Their traveling together, as they did, before marriage, brought a great scandal upon the cause. People generally felt that such intimacy should not exist between unmarried persons, and begged him to leave Ellen at home, and go himself and preach the gospel. He met them with insult and abuse, declaring that he *never would bow to man*. The churches all through the State of Maine (which is Ellen's native state) lost confidence in them. There was occasionally here and there a family, or individual, whom they seemed to hold under a kind of mesmeric influence, that stood by and defended them. They were after awhile married, and worked West, where they were not much known; and perhaps she learned to be more cautious, and have more consistent visions. If these visions which she now has are of God, the first were; and if the first were of God, the door of mercy was closed in 1844, and woe to the poor sinners this side of there. We *know* that God does not lie; and some of them *did* lie, to my certain knowledge. God does not contradict himself, and her visions have contradicted each other. I have been told that they deny on this coast that she ever saw the door of mercy closed; but there are thousands of living witnesses who know that a blacker lie could not be invented, and I am one of the number.

"L. S. B."

It is a well-known fact, most fully attested by reliable witnesses, that Mrs. Ellen White professed to have visions from the Lord, that the door of mercy was closed against sinners on the tenth day of the seventh month in 1844; and that then Jesus, for the first time, went into the Holy of Holies.

The following statement is from one who *has* been a preacher among those who observe the seventh day: "I was at Geo. Barker's house, in Norridgewock, Me., in 1869, when I asked Mrs. Ellen White, in the presence of several ministers, if she ever had a vision showing that the door of mercy was closed? She answered, 'I never did.'

"Soon after, Elder C. Stratton came into the room and asked the same question, and received the same answer.

"I affirm this to be true.

"L. L. Howard.

"Boston, Sept. 28, 1874."

A careful examination of the Sabbath question affords the following facts: (1.) The early Christians did *not* consider the fourth commandment binding. (2.) The pope did not change the day. (3.) That Constantine did not change the day. (4.) That the only reason given to the Jews for keeping the fourth commandment was because of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. (5.) That the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was a feast-day, and all feast-see covet

days have ceased. (6.) That a Jew could keep the ten commandments and be lost. (7.) That the Decalogue had nothing to do with the *motive*, but only the *deed*. (8.) That there is no distinction between the law of Moses and the law of God. (9.) That all nations cannot keep the Sabbath of the Jews. (10.) That the law could not give eternal life, but Christ can. (11.) That the Decalogue was the old covenant. (12.) That the old covenant is abolished. (13.) That the old covenant, with its ordinances, was one of bondage, from which we are now delivered through Christ the mediator of the New Covenant.

VISIONS AND PROPHECIES.

Those who have any confidence in Mrs. E. G. White's visions and prophecies, as coming from the Lord, should read a work entitled, "Mrs. E. G. White's claim to Divine Inspiration Examined, by H. E. Carver." Address, "Hope of Israel," Marion, Iowa. Price 20 cents; postage, 2 cents.

We do not see how any one can have a particle of confidence in Mrs. White's visions, after reading this work of Bro. Carver, who has been intimately associated with those who sympathise with Mrs. White. Everybody should read this work who is at all inclined to believe Mrs. White is a true prophetess of the Lord, as claimed by the Seventh-day Advent people, whose head-quarters are at Battle Creek, Mich.

The following extracts are samples of the work: —

"It is claimed by our Seventh-day Adventist brethren, that those who come out in opposition to the visions, do so in consequence of some fault, sin, or idol, held by them, and which are reproved or corrected by the visions. I can truly say that this does not apply in my case. . . . I was never reproved in any way, or on any account, by Mrs. White, either by vision or otherwise; but have reason to believe that I enjoyed the full confidence of both Eld. and Mrs. White. It will appear, as the following pages are read, that, instead of being prompted by any such motive, I was forced by accumulating evidence, not only to give up my long-cherished hope that the visions of Mrs. White would be vindicated, but also my confidence in the Christian integrity of Elder White and wife.

"When I first became fully convinced of the binding obligation of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, upwards of ten years ago, and attached myself to the people now called Seventh-day Adventists, I did so with a full knowledge of Mrs. White's claim to divine inspiration. . . . My previous Advent experience of many years predisposed me to receive their theory of the three messages of Rev. 14, as well as that of the two-horned beast of Rev. 13, without sufficient investigation, as I have since learned; but for years I fully believed it. Being thus in perfect union with the brethren on these main points, and as faith in the visions was not made a test of fellowship among us then, I felt very favorably disposed towards them, from the fact that Eld. and Mrs. White were so intimately connected with what I then believed to be the correct Advent theory; and for several years my efforts were directed to the strengthening of my own confidence, as well as that of others with whom I was connected, in the visions. Believing, as I did, that the theory of the three messages was correct, I could only wish that a point of such great importance as the claim of the presence of divine inspiration among us should be fully vindicated by adequate results; and to this end I waited and watched and hoped, but, as the sequel proved, in vain.

"As has already been remarked, the visions were not at that time made a test among us, nor were they made a topic of public investigation, at least here in Iowa. In one of the Seventh-day Adventist publications, however, it was claimed that, among other things, the visions were given to *correct those who should err from Bible truth.* This attracted attention and created alarm in the mind of one of our number, Eld. S. Everett, who saw in this the germ of that unscriptural and oppressive hierarchy that now reigns over the consciences of our Seventh-day Adventist brethren. Bro. Everett entered his protest against this claim of the visions, and faithfully warned us of the result. The brethren could not believe that such would ever be the case, and were much tried with him on account of his course.

"At this point, Eld. Cornell appeared amongst us, and attempted to settle the agitation produced by Bro. Everett's efforts against the visions. In prosecuting the case against Bro. Everett, Eld. Cornell manifested a most unkind, hasty, and unchristian spirit, which was a source of grief to the entire church, and which I took upon myself to communicate to Mrs. White. After having received this information from me, she published in the next 'Testimony,' that she had been shown that Eld. Cornell had acted hastily in Bro. Everett's case. The reader will readily perceive that this was not calculated to strengthen my confidence in the visions; but, as I fully believed in their theory of the messages, &c., and, consequently, that they were the peculiar, if not the exclusive, people of God, I did my best to crush down the uprising of unbelief, and acquiesce in the situation.

"Such was my state of mind at the time of the organization of the church at Pilot Grove, Iowa, at which I was present and desired to become a member; but, as I could not express a full belief in the inspiration of the visions of Mrs. White, it was thought best that I should not become a member at that time, although I enjoyed then, and afterwards, the confidence and sympathy of all the brethren. Deeply interested in the prosperity of the cause I had espoused, I communicated all the facts in the case to Eld. White and wife, and expected from them instructions or advice as to my case; but nothing was received until the next vision was published, wherein she says she saw that a wrong use was being made of her visions in Iowa. Here, then, were two instances in which she claimed to see, in vision, things that I had communicated to her myself; and yet, my attachment to the main points of our theory was strong enough to close my eyes to the folly of her claims to divine inspiration.

"During a visit to our church, Eld. White and wife spent a portion of their time in the family of a brother, with whom I was intimately connected, and there witnessed some of his peculiarities of demeanor, and which she afterwards wrote to him as having seen them in vision, but which, in fact, were apparent to any one who happened to spend a few hours in the household, and of which we were all aware from our own observation.

"The fourth and last case concerning individuals which has come under my personal observation or knowledge, and which involves the inspiration of a vision, is that of two members of the Pilot Grove church, the nature of which it is not necessary to mention. This case produced a great commotion and trial in the church, which was not quieted until a vision was received from Mrs. White, in which she saw that the brother involved in the case, and who had been dismissed from the church, should resume his place in it. This brother, in kindly attempting afterwards to win me back to my allegiance to Eld. and Mrs. White, referred to his own case as a remarkable and indisputable evidence of the divine inspiration of the visions; 'for,' said he, 'she saw my case in vision.' I told him I thought Mrs. White knew of the case before she had the vision. This he denied. I then told him that the other party implicated with him had positively asserted in the presence of my family that Mrs. White did know all about it, for the entire case had been written out and sent to her. These parties were then, and are now, believers in the visions.

"Such facts as these could not but make some impression upon my mind, and give me some uneasiness; but I tried hard to repress such feelings on account of my attachment to the true advent theory, as I thought they held it, and so the time passed until the rebellion of the Southern States broke out. As this unhappy and wicked rebellion progressed, and volunteering into the army fell off, the question as to what would be duty, in case of being drafted, naturally presented itself to

my mind, and became a subject of absorbing interest. Being conscientiously opposed to Christians fighting with carnal weapons, and believing that the church, as a church, ought to occupy the same position, I urged that the question should be discussed in the columns of the 'Review,' so we could come to some unity of views and action. To this it was objected, that the office was already in danger of destruction, by the war element of the community, and it was necessary to act with great caution. This was expressed by Eld. White, when he and his wife were at the council at Lisbon, Iowa. An article appeared in the 'Review,' from the pen of Eld. White, in which he took the position, that to engage in war would necessarily involve the violation of two of the commandments of God; but that, in case of being drafted, the government would assume the responsibility of such violation. Such a puerile subterfuge, coming from a source so intimately related to the professed prophetess of the church, operated as a severe blow against her divine inspiration, and more especially, as Mrs. White found it necessary to come out in the paper with an apology for her husband, in which, after stating that *something* had to be said upon the subject, she said it was the best light they had. According to the Elder's position, the three Hebrew children would have been justified in worshiping the golden image, and permitting the government of Nebuchadnezzar to assume the responsibility of their violation of the second commandment, and thus escape the ordeal of the fiery furnace; or, perhaps he was preparing the way to obey the decree of the two-horned beast, and let that government bear the responsibility of his violation of the fourth commandment. At any rate, the publication of such a sentiment, by the husband of one who claims that her visions are given to correct those who err from Bible truth, bore heavily in my mind against her claims to divine inspiration.

"The whole church was anxiously and prayerfully desirous to know what was duty at that crisis, and it did seem that the time had come, if it ever was to come, for the divine inspiration of Mrs. White to be demonstrated. True, an attempt was made to gain some credit for her, by publishing a vision of the battle of Bull Run, *after* it was fought, and the result known; but the attempt was so ludicrously absurd, that it was, I believe, never repeated. She could describe the battle of Bull Run after it occurred; but she could not tell us beforehand of Sherman's triumphant march, of Lee's surrender to Grant at Appomattox, or of our much beloved and lamented President's assassination. She could not even give us any instructions how to act in case of being drafted, until it was too late to be of service.

"She did, however, claim to have visions during the war, one of the principal items of which related to the proper length of the sisters' dresses; and upon this subject, plain and simple as it may seem, her instructions to the sisters have been contradictory. . . .

"When, I ask, did it ever occur in the lifetime of any of the prophets of God, that the church was brought into as close and straight a place as we were in the late war? and, notwithstanding earnest and repeated solicitations of divine aid, the prophet fail to give the necessary information and instruction?

"I wish here to give a brief history of what is called the 'Rebellion in Iowa,' the object being to illustrate a point regarding the claim of divine inspiration for Mrs. White. In the spring of 1865, Elder B. F. Snook, feeling restive under the reign of the *regime* at Battle Creek, and probably very doubtful of the visions, wrote a letter to Eld. Ingraham, proposing to him to act independently of the Battle Creek authorities, in proclaiming the truths of the Bible. This letter was placed in the hands of Eld. White at a meeting in Wisconsin, who endorsed on the back, in substance, this, 'Rebellion in Iowa,' and immediately wrote to Elder Snook, informing him of what he knew, and stating that his (Eld. Snook's) case would be attended to at the Pilot Grove Conference, soon to convene. He also wrote to Eld. Brinkerhoff that he had evidence in his possession of Eld. Snook's rebellion, and wishing him (Eld. B.) to be present at the conference. In view of the anticipated trial, these two ministers prepared themselves for their defence, by collecting evidence against the visions; and thus armed, they attended the conference. It is not necessary to relate the incidents of that conference, or the influences brought to bear upon Elders S. and B., resulting in their surrender. Suffice it to say that, although Eld. White utterly refused to enter into a discussion of the merits of the visions until the other Elders had capitulated, he solemnly pledged himself not to leave Iowa till every point of difficulty was made plain, and every objection to the visions removed; and thus the matter was temporarily arranged.

"In her report of this matter, Mrs. White is particular to state that they (her husband and self) were deeply impressed that they must come to Iowa, and that they knew nothing of the rebellion here till a few hours before they met its leaders face to face at Pilot Grove; thus, leading the church at large to regard her as being here by divine inspiration; and, doubtless, such was the influence of her report upon the minds of those who did not know that, at least, two weeks previously, her husband had endorsed upon the back of that letter, 'Rebellion in Iowa.' In regard to the facts connected with the letter, Eld. White is my authority, for he related to me the incidents I have named.

"In pursuance of his pledge, Eld. and Mrs. White visited the church here at Marion, but entered into no public vindication of the visions; and I have reason to think that the greatest efforts that were privately made were for my own benefit; for nearly all the time spent here was at my house; and, during their stay, I devoted my time and attention exclusively to the object of their visit. Elders Snook and Brinkerhoff had procured from the East some of the earliest publications of Elders White and Bates, and those portions relating to the 'shut door theory' had made a deep impression on my mind, calling up old associations, when I, too, was a believer in that error. Seeing that the early visions ran in perfect harmony with that theory, I asked them whether Mrs. White was a believer in the shut door doctrine at the time of her first vision, hoping that the answer would be in the negative, in which case, it would seem that there was no correspondence between her faith and the vision. The answer, however, was in the affirmative, and then Eld. White remarked, 'Bro. Carver, I will make an admission to you I would not make to a sharp opponent. Considering the circumstances of the case, it would not be strange if they should give a coloring to the vision.' He then related the circumstances. At the time of the vision, the Advent band in Portland, Me., were divided, some having denied their experience, and become nominal Adventists, and some holding on to their experience, and the shut door view. The latter class met at her father's house, and she was one of them, and believed in the shut door; and, besides, was young at the time. These are the circumstances he voluntarily admitted might have given coloring to the vision, Mrs. White at the same time sitting by and assenting to his statements.

"Eld. Loughborough, who was present, in attempting subsequently to explain away Eld. White's admission, stated that the vision under consideration was one given at Exeter, at which time they were laboring for the conversion of sinners. This is a misstatement of the Elder's, for I did not know that she had a vision at Exeter at all. My question distinctly related to her *first vision*, in which she claims to be shown the travels of the Advent people, and I wished to know if she was a believer in the shut door *at that time*.

"I wish here to give an extract from the pen of Eld. White, published in a pamphlet called 'A word to the little flock,' in 1847:—

> "'However true this extract may be in relation to reveries, it is *not* true in regard to the visions, for the author *does not* obtain the sentiments of her visions from previous teaching or study. When she received her first vision, December, 1844, she, and all the band in Portland, Me., where her parents then resided, had given up the midnight cry and shut door, as being in the past. It was then that the Lord showed her, in vision, the error into which she and the band in Portland had fallen. She then related her vision to the band, and about sixty confessed their error, and acknowledged their seventh month experience to be the work of God.'

"The reader will readily perceive that these two statements cannot both be true, and whatever of falsehood will attach to Eld. White in making these contradictory statements, will also involve his wife, for she was present and assented to his statement to me; and it is but reasonable to believe that she assented to his statement in the book. He stated to me that, at the time of her *first vision*, *she was* a believer in the shut door view, whilst in the book he affirms that at that time she *was not*, although he admits she had previously been one, and the vision was given to bring her and others back upon the same position, which it accomplished. Now, Eld. and Mrs. White, or their apologist, Uriah Smith, may take whichever horn of this dilemma they please. In regard to this shut door error, I will speak more fully in another part of this work."

It is a well-known fact, that the followers of Mrs. White have decided, and so published, that Mrs. White's visions are from the Lord, and that she is his true prophetess.

Bro. Carver says: —

"The opinion had gained ground among us, that the original practice among the brethren, of observing the Sabbath from six o'clock to six o'clock, instead of from sunset to sunset, had been confirmed by a vision; and this was stated in some of our publications. Bro. Ball raised this as an objection, but the statements and explanations given satisfied him it was an error, and he so stated to me. I told him if he would furnish me with the evidence, I would correct the mistake through our paper, and I subsequently gave the following statement in its columns: —

> "There has been a belief in the minds of some, including ourself, that, by means of a clock-face, with the hands pointing to six o'clock, seen by Mrs. E. G. White in vision, the former practice of our brethren in keeping the Sabbath from six to six o'clock, instead of from sunset to sunset, was confirmed.

> We are satisfied now, from the evidence we have, that this is a mistake: and that Mrs. White never had any such vision; and we cheerfully proceed to correct the error by a statement of the facts in the case.
>
> "In 1846, the Sabbath was first brought to the notice of Eld. White and wife, by Eld. Joseph Bates. (See *Spir. Gifts*, Vol. II., p. 82.) Elder Bates was a strong advocate for commencing the Sabbath at six o'clock, and his view was adopted by those who affiliated with Eld. White and wife; and this practice was kept up for nine years, until the fall of 1855. As early, however, as 1847, a portion of Sabbath-keepers called in question the six o'clock time, some adopting sunrise, and some sunset. In the same year, Mrs. White professedly had a vision, in which she was shown that sunrise was the wrong time to begin the Sabbath, but was not shown that sunset was the right time. She merely heard these words repeated: 'From even to even shall ye celebrate your sabbaths.' Elder Bates was present, and succeeded in satisfying all present that 'even' was six o'clock.
>
> "Satisfied on the point, they continued the practice as before, from six to six. About two years later, however, in 1849, the subject was again agitated at a conference at Rocky Hill, Conn., at which Eld. White and wife, and Eld. Bates were present. At that time a brother, by the name of Chamberlain, in whose spiritual exercises, or 'gifts,' there was great confidence, seemed to be very powerfully exercised, and amid groans and tears he called for chalk, and marked out upon the floor the figure of a clock-face, the hands pointing out six o'clock; and a general impression prevailed that this was the work of the spirit of God. By reference to *Spir. Gifts*, Vol. II., pp. 91, 96, and 98, it will be perceived that this Bro. Chamberlain was at that time a leading one among them; and it was by his arrangement that that Conference was held. Here, then, the question was a second time settled that six o'clock was the right time to commence the Sabbath, and the last time by divine inspiration, as was supposed; and the practice was kept up for six years longer, till 1855. During all this time, however, the subject was more or less discussed, until finally the agitation became such, that fears were entertained of a division among the adherents of Eld. White and wife. And Eld. Andrews finally decided, at Eld. White's request, to devote his time to the subject, till he ascertained what the Bible taught in regard to it. The result was, a general belief that the Bible taught sunset time. Eld. Bates, and some others, however, were not satisfied, it seems, with the evidence, and *then* Mrs. White had a vision for their benefit, to save them from being lost, or, at least, out of harmony with the body, and that vision was that sunset time was the right time.
>
> "These are the facts in the case, so far as they have come to

light; and now we wish to offer a few comments. Let us, in imagination, take our position in the midst of the Conference at Rocky Hill in 1849. Looking back from this standpoint two years, we see Mrs. White claiming to have been shown, in a heavenly vision, that it was wrong to commence the Sabbath at sunrise, but that it should be from 'even to even.' From this it seems that the subject was deemed sufficiently important to induce the God of Heaven to divinely and miraculously instruct his people in regard to duty, else the vision would not have been given. These instructions, however, were perverted and frustrated by Eld. Bates. The subject has been agitated, and a diversity of opinion prevails among Sabbath-keepers up to the time of this Conference at Rocky Hill. Here are about fifty gathered on this occasion. Among them Eld. White and wife, Eld. Bates, who misled them in this matter two years ago, and others. They are generally believers in spiritual gifts, and two present claims to possess them. The subject is again agitated, Which is right, six o'clock time, or sunset? Under all the circumstances, have we not a right to expect that Eld. Bates' mistake will be corrected, and sunset time be established? When the prophet Daniel made a mistake as to what the angel of God told him, an angel was commissioned to 'fly swiftly,' in order to correct that misunderstanding; but here some two years had elapsed, and surely the mistake will be corrected now. What do we see? Does Mrs. White have any vision? Not any! But we see Bro. Chamberlain, in whose spiritual exercises there is great confidence, powerfully exercised, and, amid groans and tears, calling for the chalk, with which he makes some marks on the floor. Let us approach, and see what he is doing. Is he writing that 'from even to even' means from sunset to sunset? If so, it will be a step in the right direction, even if we doubt his divine inspiration; but, instead of this, we see him chalk out a likeness of a clock-face, with the hands indicating six o'clock. Thus Eld. Bates' mistake of two years previous was confirmed, and, as was generally supposed, by divine inspiration; and Mrs. White was just as much under the delusion for the next six years as any one else.

"In addition to the authority cited above, we are indebted to an article in a late number of the 'Review,' from the pen of Eld. White; also a letter from Eld. Ransom Hicks, kindly furnished us by Bro. W. H. Ball, of Washington, N.H." *Hope of Israel, Vol. II., No.* 24.

SHUT DOOR.

By the "*shut door*" theory is meant, that Mrs. White, and others, taught, that on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, Christ ceased to act as mediator for sinners, and that, consequently, there would be no genuine conversions after that date. This position was confirmed by her visions.

Bro. Carver says: —

"Uriah Smith, in treating on this subject, asserts, and attempts to prove, that the shut door doctrine, as held by them, and sustained by vision, does not, and never did, preclude the conversion and salvation of sinners. To those who are thoroughly acquainted with this subject, from first to last, Editor Smith's lack of candor will be a striking feature of his late pamphlet, put forth in behalf of the divine inspiration of Mrs. White. In that part relating to the 'shut door,' he writes in such a way as to leave a doubt upon the mind of the reader whether any person among the Adventists ever believed that the time for the salvation of sinners was past. This want of candor will appear more striking, as we learn from indubitable evidence that not only did '*some* entertain this strong view,' but that for years the main body of the church to which he belongs, including Mr. and Mrs. White, held that view as an important article of their creed. We now proceed to give the testimony, proving the assertion we have just made."

The following report of one of Mrs. White's visions was published in "The Present Truth," of August, 1849: —

"I saw that the mysterious signs and wonders and false reformations would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth, but from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapped about them a religious garb which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people; but if their hearts could be seen they would appear as black as ever. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time of their salvation is past."

Brother Carver says: —

"Here she professes to have been shown the false reformations that succeeded the shutting of the door in 1844, and that they would increase and spread; but instead of making men better they would be made worse, for those who professed to be converted had not been benefited in the least, but were just as blackhearted as ever. And then, after saying she could not see the travail of soul for sinners as used to be, she gives the reason why; i.e., 'the time for their salvation is past.' It does seem that any one can see, that this is a plain, straightforward account; and, what gives certainty to this view is the fact, that it is in perfect harmony with the views of the body of Sabbath-keeping Adventists at the time the vision was first published; for they then believed (Mrs. White among them) that the time for probation for sinners was ended."

In a tract published by Eld. James White, at Oswego, N.Y., in May, 1850, entitled "The Sanctuary, the Twenty-three Hundred Days, and the Shut Door," on page 13, he says: —

> "When we came up to that point of time (tenth day of seventh month, '44), *all our sympathy, burden and prayers for sinners ceased,* and the unanimous feeling and testimony was that our work for the world was *finished for ever.*"

In harmony with the foregoing, Mrs. White says in her "Camden Vision," published June 29, 1857: —

> "Then I saw that Jesus prayed for his enemies; but that should not cause *us* or lead *us* to pray for the wicked world whom God had rejected. When he prayed for his enemies, there was hope for them, and they *could* be *benefited* and saved by his prayers, and also after (while) he was a mediator in the outer apartment for the whole world; but now his spirit and sympathy were withdrawn from the world, and our sympathy must be with Jesus, and must be withdrawn from the ungodly."

"Why did Jesus pray for the ungodly then? Because they could *be benefited and saved then.* Why does he pray for them now? Because they have been *rejected of God.* Jesus ceased to be their mediator when he left the *outer apartment* in 1844, and hence they *cannot be benefited* by his prayers since then, and hence God's people *should not pray for them now.*

"We have not presented all the testimony that might be produced on this subject, but have given sufficient, we think, to satisfy the unprejudiced mind, that the first visions of Mrs. White teach most distinctly the closing up of the probationary state of the human race in 1844, with the exception of the class of people then engaged in the Advent movement, the former having been rejected of God and given over to destruction, whilst the latter were yet to be tested by the Third Angel's Message. This is what was understood by the *shut door.*

"The question now arises, do they believe in the shut door now? We answer, that, according to Uriah Smith's late work, they do, with a slight modification, and that may be expressed thus: "The door is shut, but we hold the key, and can let you in." He asserts that a great change in the relation

continues to quote Carver!

of Jesus to the world occured in 1844, and that the means that were sufficient for the salvation of sinners previous to that time have become inefficient since then, — that now they must come to him with an understanding of his present position and work in the sanctuary, and that this can only be obtained through the medium of the Third Angel's Message; and this message is being proclaimed by the Seventh-day Adventists exclusively. Any person may see that the above is not a burlesque upon the Seventh-day Adventist faith, by reading his remarks on pp. 24 to 26 of his late work in support of the visions. True, he admits on p. 26 that there may be *true Christians* who have not yet become acquainted with this doctrine of the change of Christ's ministration from the Holy to the most Holy Place; but this only destroys the force of all he has previously said about its being *essential* to understand this change; for if one person may be a Christian and not understand this change, then others may, even all of them; and yet we find the visions describing this very class as being under the deception and influence of Satan. The vision to which I allude is the one on pp. 43 and 44 of 'Experience and Views,' where she describes those who were still bowed before the throne, upon which Jesus sat previous to 1844, but was ignorant of his removal to the inner apartment. Now mark! They are worshipers of the true God; are believers in Jesus, and are worshiping with their faces towards the heavenly Sanctuary; but do not know any thing of the change of position of the High Priest. Uriah Smith says they are true Christians, and if they should be cut down by death before learning of the change, they would be saved; but Mrs. White describes them as 'under the malign influence of Satan, — he breathing upon them, in answer to their prayers, an unholy influence, in which there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy and peace.' The only reason the vision pretends to assign why these persons did not rise up with those who arose when Jesus did, is that they did *not know* that he had risen. They were not of the *careless multitude*, because they are recognized in the attitude of worship, whilst the latter are not. In fact, they must be the identical class of *true Christians* Uriah Smith refers to, and yet under the influence of the Devil. Who can believe such absurdities?

"Seeing then that the visions of Mrs. White, as well as the doctrines and practice of the church to which she belongs, in their earlier days, agreed perfectly in teaching, that after 1844 there was to be no more salvation for sinners, the question may be asked, if we object to them giving up a doctrine when it is proved to be an error? We answer, By no means. We consider it a very commendable act to give up error when the error is made manifest; but this Mrs. White has failed to do: for, when the error of her shut door visions were demonstrated, she did not, as she ought to have done, give them up as delusions, but has permitted them to be tampered with, amended, and obnoxious features expunged from them, so as to suit the change of views and circumstances in the church. We have already given some instances of the expunging of portions of visions in subsequent editions, but we have another notable one to place before the candid reader. Before doing so, however, we wish first to call attention to what she says in 'Spiritual Gifts,' Vol. II., p. 293. 'I am just as dependent upon the spirit of the Lord in *relating* or *writing* a vision as in having a vision.' Here she claims that the very *words* in which her visions are recorded are of divine inspiration. What an egregious blunder, then, for Mr. and Mrs. White to admit to me that circumstances might color a vision, if even the relating of that vision is divinely inspired! and how sinful it must be to expunge a portion of the word of God, and one of such general and vital importance as the following, if indeed it be the word of God!

> "'I saw the state of some who stood in present truth, but *disregarded the visions* — the way God had chosen to teach in some cases those who erred from Bible truth. I saw that in striking against the visions they did not strike against the worm, the feeble instrument that God spake through, but *against the Holy Ghost.* I saw it was a small thing to speak against the instrument, but it was dangerous to slight the words of God. I saw if they were in error, and God chose to show them their errors through visions, and they disregarded the teachings of God through visions, they would be left to take their own way, and run in the way of error, and think they were right, until they would find it out too late. Then, in the time of trouble, I heard them cry to God in agony, "Why didst thou not show us our wrong that we might have got right and been ready for this time?" Then an angel pointed to them and said, "My Father taught, but you would not be taught. He spake through visions, but you disregarded his voice, and he gave you up to your own ways to be filled with your own doings."'

X

In Vault (Envelope)

"This was published at Topsham, Me., Jan. 31, 1849, on a sheet directed 'TO THOSE WHO ARE RECEIVING THE SEAL OF THE LIVING GOD,' and is signed, 'E. G. White.' This sheet now lies before me, and I have just copied the above paragraph, word for word. This was published in January, 1849, and needs no comment to show the intelligent reader the leading position Mrs. White was assuming to occupy over the minds and consciences of her brethren at that time.

"In August of that year, however, only about six months afterwards, the same vision was published over her own signature in her husband's paper called 'The Present Truth,' with the above paragraph left out. Subsequently, it was republished in 'Exp. and Views,' pp. 19 to 21, but still in its mutilated condition.

"What are we to think of a person who will suppress a portion of the word of God that is fraught with such terrible interest to those who may come in contact with the visions, — to know that a rejection of the visions will consign persons to irretrievable ruin, and yet fail to warn them of the consequences after being divinely instructed to do so?

"We now come to another subject of some importance as illustrative of the non-inspiration of the visions. We refer to a vision that may be found on page 46 of 'Exp. and Views.' She says: —

> "'I saw some looking too far off for the coming of the Lord. Time has continued on a few years longer than they expected, therefore they think it may continue a few years more, and in this way their minds are being led from present truth out after the world. In these things I saw great danger; for if the mind is filled with other things, present truth is shut out, and there is no place in our foreheads for the seal of the living God. I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the Most Holy Place was nearly finished, and that time cannot last but a very little longer.'

"We do not see how a comparison of time could have been much more clearly expressed. *Some of the brethren* were looking too far off for the coming of the Lord. How far off were they looking? Were they looking to 1868, or any remote period? The record says they thought time might continue a few years longer. Is there any thing in the connection to show what is meant by a *few years?* There is. Time has continued a *few years longer* than they expected. When did they expect the Lord's coming? In 1844. When was this vision? In 1849. Hence time had continued about five years longer than they expected, and they thought possibly it might continue as much longer; and right in this connection she says 'The time for Jesus to be in the Most Holy Place was nearly finished.' How long had he been in the Most Holy Place? Five years. Now what is the legitimate conclusion? That he will not remain there *that much longer*. How long has Jesus been there since the vision? Twenty-five years. What is the necessary conclusion? Ans., *That* vision was not divinely inspired. This conclusion is confirmed by what purports to be a vision on p. 55, 'Exp. and Views,' given June 27, 1850, being about a year after the one just considered, and while she was yet a shut door believer, as is evinced by the Camden vision, which was published the following year. Said the angel, 'Deny self; ye must step fast.' I saw that some of us have had time to get the truth and to advance step by step, and every step we have taken has given us strength to take the next; but now time is almost finished, and what we have been years learning, they will have to learn in a few months."

"THE SEALING TIME."

According to Mrs. White's visions, the seal of God is put on none but those who keep the Seventh-day Sabbath; especially since 1844. The following is from Bro. H. E. Carver's work: —

" We now come to another subject of consideration, i. e., 'The Sealing Time.' Uriah Smith, treating on this subject, takes the following positions: The Third Angel's Message is a sealing message; but a person is not sealed as soon as he embraces it. Time is given for the development of a holy character, by obedience to the truth, and to bring people to a position where they can be sealed absolutely, in the sense of having their cases forever decided for heaven. This sealing message, he thinks, commenced in 1844; but, as it must be apparent that a greater portion of the time of Christ's ministry in the Most Holy Place must be occupied with the decision of the cases of the dead, as they are the most numerous, therefore the actual sealing of the living has not yet commenced, but is about to begin. As it is not the custom among our Seventh-day Adventist friends of late years for individuals to assume the responsibility of publishing the doctrines of the church, we shall proceed to examine the position of Smith's, upon the assumption that it is the *authorized* exposition of the present views of the church on the subject; and, first, we call attention to the shrewdness of the writer in attempting to smooth over the angularities of their doctrines. He does not once tell his readers *what the seal is*. He does not tell us that the *Sabbath* is the seal, and that keeping the Sabbath is receiving the seal. Had he given this fundamental point of their faith in that connection, it would have destroyed his course of reasoning; for we think it would be difficult for him to show in what way *the dead* can keep the Sabbath, and thus be sealed. But, again: Does not Brother Smith know that (in their opinion) the sealing under contemplation is applicable *only* to the 144,000 Seventh-day Adventists, and not at all applicable to the dead? Is it not a principle of the visions themselves that the seventh-day Sabbath, as brought to light since 1844, is not a test to those also who lived previous to that time? He must know these facts; why, then, does he ignore them, and publish to the world doctrines contradictory to, and that are subversive of, them? Is it because the church is preparing to deny the past, and change front on this subject, as well as on the shut door? Time will tell. The reason why this course is being pursued will readily be seen when we come to record the early doctrines of the church, as well as the visions themselves, on this point. It will be seen that the sealing dogma runs exactly parallel with the shut door error, and that Smith's position, given above, is a perversion of the doctrines of the church and visions of those early days. If we go back but a few years, we find a work of thirty-two pages, published at Battle Creek (Mark of the Beast and Seal of the living God), devoted to the task of proving that the observance of the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, is the 'mark of the beast,' while the observance of the seventh day is the seal of the living God, as brought to view in Rev. 7: 1, 4, and ch. 14: 9. We quote from the summing-up, on pp. 25 and 26: —

"'Reader, which will you choose? God is calling upon you to choose whether you will keep his commandments and receive his seal, or obey his rival, the beast, and receive his mark. He is warning you of the awful consequences of the latter. The great day of his wrath is just before us, and we need a shield in that day. The destroying angel is about to pass through; the men with the slaughter weapons are about to smite; the four winds are about to be loosed; and nothing but God's token, or mark, or seal, will cause the destroyer to pass over us. Already has the angel ascended from the East, having the seal of the living God. The sealing message — that of the third angel — is being proclaimed. The time has come for the fulfillment of the prophetic message of Isa. 8: 16, "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." The beast — the changer of times and laws — has broken God's testimony, and it must be bound up; he has torn the seal (the Sabbath) from the law, and it must be restored; and, while the angel with the seal of the living God passes through, the servants of God are sealed in their foreheads, while, at the same time, the seal is restored to the law among those servants or disciples. It remains that a few words be said with regard to the future of the two classes of worshipers. Our text threatens the worshipers of the beast with wrath without mixture, while another text promises those who keep the commandments of God a right to the tree of life, and an entrance through the gates into the city.'

"Hence the following positions are, First, the seal of the living God is the *Sabbath*. Second, The sealing angel having ascended from the east, is now engaged in this work of sealing the servants of God with the Sabbath. Third, that those thus sealed (by observing the seventh-day Sabbath) will be the ones who have a right to the tree of life, and admission into the New Jerusalem. In a tract, published in 1862, at the same office, called 'WAR AND THE SEALING,' the same views are presented. We quote from page 15: —

"'Thus we have found, First, that the seal of God is some distinguishing characteristic of his people. Second, That that distinguishing mark is found in the commandments of God. Third, That, according to Rev. 7: 3, compared with chap. 14: 1, the Father regards his name as his seal. Fourth, That in the fourth commandment, and there only, the Father's name is found, so that wherever that commandment is placed, there the Father's name is said to be. Fifth, That if the observance of the ordinance of circumcision could be a seal of the righteousness of the faith between God and Abraham, the observance of the true Sabbath may be the seal of God in reference to his people. Sixth, That the Sabbath is explicitly declared by God to be the sign or seal between himself and his people. The fourth commandment is the only one of the ten on which there is a difference of faith and practice between the people of God and other religious professors; hence no other commandment but this can form the distinguishing characteristic of his true people.'

"Hence, then, we discover, that the leading ideas of this doctrine, as held by them a few years ago, are that the *sealing* of the *living* people of God is now in process of accomplishment, and that this sealing is 'in the sense of having their cases for ever decided for heaven.' Smith, however, and through him the Seventh-day Adventist Church, now repudiate this doctrine, once so highly esteemed among them.

"We now propose, if the patient reader will go back with us twenty years in the history of this people, to show when and how this sealing originated, or, rather, how it received the consistency and form it maintained among them, till its recent repudiation by the editor of the 'Review.' We have before us a pamphlet bearing this title, 'A SEAL OF THE LIVING GOD. A HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR THOUSAND OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD BEING SEALED IN 1849.' This was published by Eld. Joseph Bates, at New Bedford, in 1849; and the title-page itself shows very clearly that the writer believed the sealing work among the living was then in progress; and yet Smith says that this work has not yet (1868) begun. In his preface addressed 'TO THE LITTLE FLOCK,' he says: —

in Vault
Brown
[illegible]

> "'The time has now emphatically arrived in their history to *mark* and *number* them for the kingdom. Yes, one more distinctive and peculiar mark by which they will be known, not for a few years here, only, but for ever, even for ever and ever, throughout the boundless ages of eternity, is this: They are now being sealed in their foreheads with "a seal of the living God," the receiving of which [he subsequently says] will bear us through the time of trouble, and for ever turn our captivity at the coming of the Lord.'

"This is very explicit and unmistakable language, and shows that the writer believed that, as early as 1849, Seventh-day Adventists were (in the language of a work on this subject in 1863) being '*Sealed* and *labeled*, Jesus Christ, care of God, Heavenly Jerusalem.' The testimony already presented shows very conclusively what was the faith and teaching of that church on the subject of the sealing, from its early days down to a comparatively late period.

"But it may be urged, that we have not shown any connection between this doctrine of the sealing and the visions. This we will now proceed to do. We quote from Eld. Bates's book, page 24: —

> "'I had believed that this *ascending* was to have been taken in a literal sense, the sealing messengers going at first, from the borders of the Atlantic (sun's rising), west and north, declaring the sealing message; but God, in answer to united prayer, gave us the clear light upon it through Sister Ellen G. White. Some of the circumstances were as follows: A small company of brethren and sisters were assembled in meeting in Dorchester, near Boston, Mass. Before the meeting commenced, some of us were examining some of the points in the sealing message; some difference of opinion existed about the correctness of the view of the word ascending, &c., and, whereas we had made the publishing of the message a subject of prayer at the Topsham conference (Me.) a little previously, and the way to publish appeared not sufficiently clear, we therefore resolved, unitedly, to refer it all to God. After some time spent in earnest prayer for light and instruction, God gave Sister White the following in vision; viz.: "Where did the light break out? Let thine angels teach us where the light broke out? It commenced from a little, then thou didst give one light after another. The testimony and commandments are linked together; they cannot be separated. . . . The angels have not let go; for the saints are not all sealed. The time of trouble has commenced; it is begun. The reason why the four winds have not let go is because the saints are not all sealed. . . . Why, they are just ready to blow. There's a check put on because the saints are not sealed. Yea, publish the things thou hast seen and heard, and the blessing of God will attend. Look ye! that rising is in strength and grows brighter and brighter. That truth is the seal; that's why it comes last.
>
> "'The shut door we have had. God has taught and taught; but that experience is not the seal; and that commandment, that has been trodden under foot, will be exalted. And when ye get that you will go through the time of trouble.'

"This is the vision, and Eld. Bates says of it: —

> "'The above was copied word for word, as she spake in vision, therefore it's unadulterated; some sentences escaped us, and some we have not copied here. This, probably, is sufficient to show the answer to our prayers. *Here first we were taught to publish the sealing message*, and God's blessing would follow. Second, That the time of trouble had commenced. Third, That the four angels had not let go, because the saints were not all sealed. Fourth, That it was God

which restrained the powers. Fifth, That the Sabbath and the shut door were the connecting truths that was now the present truth. Sixth, That the Sabbath is the seal, because it's the greatest and the last truth, and continues for ever. Seventh, That the ascending from the rising of the sun is symbolical, and represents the rising of the Holy Sabbath from the Eastern Continent (bordering on the ocean) of these United States.'

"We now have the evidence before us as to when and how this sealing doctrine arose. It seems that the subject had been discussed among them to some extent, previous to this vision; but they were undecided as to the propriety of publishing it to the world until they were authorized by Mrs. White's vision: so that the visions are entitled to the credit (if it be a credit) of proclaiming to the world that at that time, 1849, The Seventh-day Adventists *were being sealed for the kingdom of God.* This vision was seen about the 10th of November, 1848, and the book containing the sealing message, as it was called, and from which we have given the above testimony, was published the following January, 1849.

"But now, to show that Eld. Bates has not misrepresented Mrs. White as to what constitutes the seal, and as to some then being sealed, we would refer to a vision already noticed in this work, and which was published over Mrs. W.'s own signature, in the same month and year that Eld. Bates's book appeared. That vision is addressed '*To those who are receiving the seal of the living God.*' In this vision she says: 'If the mind is filled with other things present truth is shut out, and there is no place in our foreheads for the seal of the living God. *This seal is the Sabbath.* Now, if language, as used above, has any meaning, we have proved that the Seventh-day Adventists believed and taught for many years that the sealing of 144,000 living saints, in the sense of sealing them absolutely for salvation, has been in progress at least twenty years. We have proved, too, that the vision sustains this view. Mark particularly this expression in the vision: 'All who are saved will be tried upon it (the Sabbath) in some way.' This was spoken in 1848, and teaches, that from that time, at least, every true child of God has in some way been tested on the Sabbath truth, and that those not thus tested will not be saved. Such were the views of the church at that time, when they were involved in the shut door delusion; but now they are at work, through their editor, to amend and modify their extreme views so as to suit the present condition of things. In doing this, however, he has struck directly against the visions; for nothing is more susceptible of proof than that the visions teach, and the church believed, that the sealing time of the living children of God began more than twenty-five years ago. This the editor denies, and in denying rejects the visions.

"But perhaps some may ask why it is they are thus changing position on this subject. We think we can give a satisfactory reason for it, and show the difficulty in which they are involved by adhering strictly to their long-cherished view, and the visions sustaining it. It will be noticed that the church believed, and the visions taught, simply that the Sabbath is the seal, and that those who keep the Sabbath are the sealed ones. This would do very well for those early days; but of late years it has come to pass that there are other Sabbath-keepers, and other Sabbath-keeping churches beside the Seventh-day Adventists (and Seventh-day Baptists whom the Seventh-day Adventists have ignored in their calculations); and if this old sealing doctrine be true, they (the outsiders) are just as much sealed as those of their own organization. They are not prepared to admit this, hence the doctrine must be modified, notwithstanding the attempt must result in destroying the validity of the visions; and this work of amending, the editor of the 'Review' is peculiarly qualified to perform, and at the same time make great professions of love for, and attachment to, the visions."

After a careful examination of the foregoing facts, relating to Mrs. White's visions, we think it is most clearly shown that they do not come from the Lord; consequently, are of no value to the Christian, and should be rejected by all the true disciples of Jesus.

M. G.